

Chinese fighter aircraft—as they have done once already over the Gulf of Tonkin.

It is a striking proof of the increased political maturity of the American armed services, that there has been no grumbling or sneering about this "black seat driving," as it would surely have been called in the old days. The military leaders have seen that these operations are as much political as military. Hence there has been nothing even remotely resembling the tantrums of the higher naval command in the second Cuban crisis.

The military leaders are not the only persons who have changed markedly, however. The phenomenon is hard to define, but these last months have clearly somewhat changed the President himself.

Perhaps the best clue is the familiar experience of the man who has never been in combat; who goes into combat with the self-doubts that any normal man feels in these circumstances; and who then finds he can do what needs doing in a quite satisfactory manner. This is a truly liberating experience, as all know who have had it.

Like the man who has never been in combat, President Johnson before Pleiku had never taken quite the sort of decision that he took when the attacks on North Vietnam were ordered at last. He now tells all and sundry that this decision involved no change of policy, that all had been foreseen, and so on and on. Maybe he believes this himself. But, in fact, a very major Rubicon was crossed.

Crossing it gave the President none of the exhilaration that another sort of national leader might have felt. Being field commander now does not excite him as it would have excited Franklin Delano Roosevelt and John F. Kennedy. As someone or other remarked, "Johnson is not the sort of man who will collect ship models after he is out of office."

But one suspects, nonetheless, that he has somehow been liberated, and even enlarged, by making a cruelly hard decision that was foreign to his previous experience, and by taking a task in hand that is not really to his taste. Certainly he looms much larger in the world today than on the day of his triumphant reelection.

In Moscow and Peiping, in Paris, and in other quarters where it is desirable to have the President of the United States regarded as pretty formidable and not to be lightly tampered with, the upward revision of the going estimates of Lyndon Johnson has been almost an audible process. And rightly so, too; for he has removed that last doubt that with any luck at all, his time in office may prove to be one of the major Presidencies.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Daily News, Apr. 28, 1965]

**BRIDGES VERSUS PEOPLE**

President Johnson at his Tuesday press conference expressed wonderment that people who are disturbed by our bombing of bridges in North Vietnam never seem to be upset by such events as the Communist bombing of our Embassy in Saigon nor by Vietcong murders of women and children.

That puzzles us, too.

There can be many arguments against war as an institution. But to condemn the use of force on one side, while condoning it on the other, must be either ridiculous or coldly cynical.

Nevertheless, a good many Americans—not a majority, to be sure—seem to have been caught up in this frenzy.

The fact is that the Communists are counting on just such a reaction in this country to help them achieve their goal. They believe our natural disinclination toward the use of force eventually will cause us to give in rather than fight to the finish in Vietnam.

As the President made clear, however, the Vietnam war is not going to conclude that way. We did not make the war, but we are there to stay. We are, in Mr. Johnson's words, not about to "tuck our tails and run home."

Meanwhile, it will be good for the American people to remember that, as the President indicated, it is more useful in war to blow up a cold steel bridge than to murder a child.

**ADJOURNMENT**

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 14 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, in accordance with the previous order, until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 5, 1965, at 12 o'clock meridian.

**HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**

TUESDAY, MAY 4, 1965

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., used this verse of Scripture:

*Luke 12: 32: Fear not, little flock; for it is your Father's good pleasure to give you the kingdom.*

Eternal God, when we deal honestly and sincerely with ourselves, we see how much of faith and fortitude, of patience and perseverance we daily need if we would follow Thy principles and spirit in our individual and social life.

May we be numbered among those whose inner life is redeemed from selfishness to a life of sympathy and service for the common good of mankind and the higher life of humanity.

Inspire us to give ourselves, with wholehearted dedication to the dawning of that better and brighter day when we shall cultivate a nobler skill in discovering and developing those capacities not only for a more splendid human personality but a finer social order.

Help us to give our plans and programs for the Great Society a more personal touch and may we be partners with all who would give vitality and validity to that lofty mission which is fruitful not only in an individual but in a social sense.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

**THE JOURNAL**

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

**MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE**

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 5702. An act to extend for 1 year the date on which the National Commission on Food Marketing shall make a final report to the President and to the Congress and to provide necessary authorization of appropriations for such Commission.

The message also announced that the Presiding Officer of the Senate, pursuant to Public Law 115, 78th Congress, entitled "An act to provide for the disposal of certain records of the U.S. Government," appointed Mr. MONRONEY and Mr. CARLSON members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate for the disposition of executive papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States numbered 65-11.

**PRIVATE CALENDAR**

The SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first individual bill on the Private Calendar.

**CHILDREN OF MRS. ELIZABETH A. DOMBROWSKI**

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1291) for the relief of the children of Mrs. Elizabeth A. Dombrowski.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 1291

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to each child of Mrs. Elizabeth A. Dombrowski, of Parma, Ohio, widow of Victor E. Dombrowski, of Parma, Ohio, the amount which the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs certifies to him would have been payable to each such child under section 542 of title 38 of the United States Code for the period from July 1, 1960, to the date which each such child actually began receiving a pension under such section: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

**CWO ELDEN R. COMER**

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1374) for the relief of CWO Elden R. Comer.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 1374

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Elden R. Comer, Route 3, Box 22, Orland, California, the sum of \$1,680.62 in full settlement of the claim of the said Elden R. Comer against the United States. A claim was timely executed by the claimant under date of March 28, 1955, as prepared by the Navy Finance Center, Cleveland, Ohio, but there is no record of any Government action thereon. A subsequent claim was filed October 18, 1962, and payment was made for all amounts not barred by the statute of limitations. The above referred principal

amount is for the balance of retired pay owing for the barred period August 1946 to October 1952. No part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### MRS. NATHALIE ILINE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1380) for the relief of Mrs. Nathalie Iline.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill? Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

#### MRS. HELEN VESELENAK

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1475) for the relief of Mrs. Helen Veselenak.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 1475

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the requirements in section 202(h)(1)(B) and 202(p) of the Social Security Act that proof of support be filed by the dependent parent of an insured individual within a specified period after the date of such individual's death in order to qualify for parent's insurance benefits on the basis of such individual's wages and self-employment income shall not apply with respect to the application of Mrs. Helen Veselenak, Byesville, Ohio, for parent's insurance benefits under section 202(h) of such Act on the basis of the wages and self-employment income of her son Joseph Veselenak, Junior (social security account numbered 275-16-7991), if she files such application, together with such proof of support, within the six-month period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act.*

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 3, after "requirements" insert "relating to time".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### MRS. GERTRUDE RESKIN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2155) for the relief of Mrs. Gertrude Reskin.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 2155

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the*

*requirements in section 202(h)(1)(B) and 202(p) of the Social Security Act that proof of support be filed by the dependent parent of an insured individual within a specified period after the date of such individual's death in order to qualify for parent's insurance benefits on the basis of such individual's wages and self-employment income shall not apply with respect to the application of Mrs. Gertrude Reskin, Wallingford, Connecticut, for parent's insurance benefits under section 202(h) of such Act on the basis of the wages and self-employment income of her daughter Jennie Reskin (social security account numbered 044-10-1625), if she files such application, together with such proof of support, within the six-month period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act.*

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### SHIRLEY SHAPIRO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2681) for the relief of Shirley Shapiro.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 2681

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$300,000 to Shirley Shapiro, of New York, New York, in full settlement of all claims against the United States based upon the injuries, expenses, disabilities, or other losses, or damages suffered as the result of an accident which occurred in Naples, Italy, on or about July 6, 1962, when a United States Navy mail truck driven by an intoxicated member of the Navy at an excessive speed went out of control and struck a parked car in which the said Shirley Shapiro was sitting. The operator of the Navy vehicle in that accident has been determined not to have been acting within the scope of his employment, and the claims based on the accident are not cognizable under the Federal Tort Claims Act provisions now set out in title 28 of the United States Code.*

*Sec. 2. No part of the amounts appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with the claims covered by this Act, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.*

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike "\$300,000" and insert "\$150,000".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### OUTLET STORES, INC.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2924) for the relief of the Outlet Stores, Inc.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

#### BYRCE A. SMITH

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3075) for the relief of Bryce A. Smith.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 3075

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Act entitled "An Act to provide for the recognition of the services of the civilian officials and employees, citizens of the United States, engaged in and about the construction of the Panama Canal", approved May 29, 1944, as amended (58 Stat. 258; 60 Stat. 873), Bryce A. Smith, Saint Petersburg, Florida, shall be held and considered, as of the effective date of such Act, to have performed three years of service in the employ of the Isthmian Canal Commission during the construction period of the Panama Canal.*

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### ESTATE OF BART BRISCOE EDGAR, DECEASED

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3076) for the relief of the estate of Bart Briscoe Edgar, deceased.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 3076

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$25,000 to the estate of Bart Briscoe Edgar, deceased, in full settlement of the claims of that estate against the United States for the death of the said Bart Briscoe Edgar, which resulted from injuries sustained on June 2, 1945, at Saint Petersburg, Florida, when he was struck by a United States Army truck proceeding as a part of an Army convoy over Gandy Bridge in Saint Petersburg, Florida: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.*

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5: Strike "\$25,000" and insert "\$5,000".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

**CHARLES MAROWITZ**

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1445) for the relief of Charles Marowitz.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

**McKOY-HELGERSON CO.**

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3137) for the relief of McKoy-Helgerson Co.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 3137

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the limitations of section 2501 of title 28 of the United States Code or of any other applicable statute of limitations, jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the United States Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of the McKoy-Helgerson Company against the United States based upon contract numbered DA-08-123-ENG-503, dated April 23, 1954, between the United States and the said McKoy-Helgerson Company for the construction of certain launching facilities at Patrick Air Force Base, Florida.*

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

**ROBERT J. BEAS**

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4443) for the relief of Robert J. Beas.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 4443

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Robert J. Beas, of 6441 Grosse Drive, Cleveland, Ohio, hereby is relieved of all liability to repay to the United States the sum of \$800. Such sum represents the amount which he was required to pay for the loss of a package of registered mail while he was employed at the United States post office at Cleveland, Ohio.*

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay to the said Robert J. Beas, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, any amounts paid by him in reduction of the indebtedness referred to in section 1 of this Act or withheld from amounts otherwise due him because of that indebtedness: *Provided, That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.*

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

**CALL OF THE HOUSE**

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 88]

Ashbrook	Halleck	Resnick
Ashley	Hays	Scheuer
Blatnik	Hollifield	Schmidhauser
Brademas	Holland	Senner
Broyhill, Va.	Ichord	Smith, Iowa
Cahill	Jones, Mo.	Stephens
Clark	Krebs	Thomson, Wis.
Clevenger	MacGregor	Toll
Curtis	Mathias	Whitener
Dickinson	Miller	Whitten
Ford,	Mills	Wilson, Bob
Gerald R.	Morrison	Young
Gialmo	O'Hara, Mich.	
Goodell	Powell	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 394 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

**LABOR-HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE APPROPRIATIONS, 1966**

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7765) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes, and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate on the bill be limited to 3 hours, one-half of the time to be controlled by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] and one-half by myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island.

The motion was agreed to.

**IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE**

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the con-

sideration of the bill H.R. 7765, with Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill. By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous-consent agreement the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] will be recognized for 1½ hours and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] will be recognized for 1½ hours.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY].

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to bring to you this afternoon the annual appropriation bill for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies. This is the 18th year that I have served on this committee. I am also pleased to announce that we have a unanimous report from our committee.

Mr. Chairman, this year we have had substantial changes in the makeup of the membership of the subcommittee. In fact, we have five new members. We have some of the older members, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. DENTON], who has served with great distinction on this committee for several years and has been a great supporter of all these programs. Also this year we have the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD], one of the outstanding members of the Committee on Appropriations, and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MATTHEWS], who has been a Member of the House for a long time and has served with distinction. Then we have on the committee the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DUNCAN], who has been invaluable as a member of this committee. We also have the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FARNUM], who has been a really hard-working new Member.

On the Republican side we have the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SHRIVER], who is the new committee member on the minority side who serves with the old members; the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL] and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD]. They have all been very helpful in the work of the committee. And we have the best clerk, Robert Moyer, on the committee.

Mr. Chairman, extensive hearings have been held. We held hearings since the first week in February and we bring to you today a unanimous report. I will place in the RECORD a summary of the action on the bill.

Department or agency	Appropriation, 1965	Budget estimates, 1966	Recommended in the bill	Bill compared with—	
				Appropriations, 1965	Budget estimates, 1966
Department of Labor.....	\$668,316,500	\$588,144,000	\$537,460,000	-\$130,856,500	-\$50,684,000
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.....	6,985,726,000	7,652,074,000	7,373,020,000	+387,294,000	-279,054,000
Related agencies.....	48,352,500	53,596,000	53,554,000	+5,201,500	-42,000
Total.....	7,702,395,000	8,293,814,000	7,964,034,000	+261,639,000	-329,780,000

Mr. Chairman, just about 90 percent of the bill we bring you today is for grants—grants to State and local governments, school and health facilities

construction grants, research grants, and training grants. With the growing public acceptance of grants-in-aid as a means of achieving national goals, there

has been more and more of this type of legislation passed in recent years with the result that the Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare appropriation bill has increased each year. This year is no exception. The bill we bring you today totals \$7,964,034,000 which is roughly \$1 billion more than the bill we brought to this House 1 year ago. The bill is \$261,639,000 over the total appropriations for fiscal year 1965, which include rather substantial sums appropriated in supplemental appropriation acts. However, the bill is \$329,780,000 less than requested in the President's budget.

As is always the case, this bill is the result of compromise. My position is well known to the Chairman and the older Members of this House. There are several places in this bill where I think that much more could be efficiently utilized and that the benefits to the Nation would be more than the cost. However, taken as a whole, I think this is a good bill and I am prepared to support it fully as it stands. While it will do little more than hold the line with some programs, the committee has greatly improved the budget in other areas to provide for some real progress.

Our hearings were quite detailed. The committee heard 230 Government witnesses and 118 public witnesses and Members of Congress for a total of 348 witnesses. The hearing record totals 4,697 pages. These hearings have all been in print for some time and available to Members, and our bill and report have been available for 5 days. In view of this and the fact that there are over 100 appropriation items in the bill, I shall not take the time of the Committee to discuss each one in detail.

The 1966 budget for the Department of Labor had several proposals for reorganization of activities. It appeared to the committee that some of these were good and would result in more efficient program management. These have been approved in the bill. However, one of the proposals was to consolidate three major parts of the Department—the Bureau of Employment Security, the Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training, and the Manpower Agency—into one huge Office of Manpower Administrator. This proposal resulted in many violent protests from various quarters. The committee could see many serious disadvantages to this proposal and very little in the way of advantages, and has not approved the consolidation. As in the past, appropriations for these three activities are carried separately in the bill.

The committee has approved the full amount of the request for manpower development and training activities—\$273,500,000. This was based on the law as it stood in January when the budget was submitted to Congress. Since that time a liberalized program has been enacted and it is my understanding that a rather sizable supplemental request is being drawn up in the executive branch.

A request of \$39,280,000 for "Advances for employment services" was included in the budget. The purpose of this proposed appropriation from general funds of the Treasury was to supplement the appropriation: "Limitation on grants to

States for unemployment compensation and employment service administration," for which funds are transferred from the unemployment trust fund. The latter appropriation has a legislative limitation that is included in the Social Security Act, as amended. The \$39 million proposed appropriation would be in addition to the funds that could be used from the trust fund, which were budgeted at the maximum authorization. It appeared to the committee that this was perhaps technically legal, but for practical purposes was simply a way of getting around the legal limitation for these activities. The request has therefore been denied. The bill does include the full legal limitation for transfer from the unemployment trust fund. This amount is \$492,100,000.

For unemployment compensation for Federal employees and ex-servicemen the bill includes \$131 million which is a reduction of \$10 million from the request, but simply reflects a downward trend in payments from this fund that has occurred since the budget was prepared.

The bill includes \$20,905,000 for the Wage and Hour Division, an increase of \$500,000 over the request to restore most of the reduction proposed in the budget for enforcement activities. All of labor, organized and unorganized, and all honest businessmen want to see the wage and hour laws properly enforced. I cannot understand the action in reducing enforcement when there is indisputable evidence of considerable violation of these laws.

The bill includes \$19,601,000 for the Bureau of Labor Statistics. This is approximately \$1 million more than the 1965 appropriation and \$1 million less than the 1966 request. The committee feels certain that this important agency can continue to do a good job—in fact, an even better job—with the funds allowed.

There are several salary and expense items in the Department of Labor that I have not mentioned specifically, but they are all at approximately the current level of operation. In fact, in total there are slightly fewer positions provided for in the bill than are provided for by the current appropriations.

In the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the first item is the Food and Drug Administration. The budget request was for \$50,352,000 and this amount is carried in the bill. While this is almost \$10 million above the current year's appropriation, it provides very little for anything but mandatory cost increases and the extremely large load of drug applications that must be evaluated and acted upon. This is workload that is not controllable by the agency, but has been brought about by recently enacted legislation. No increase was included in the budget for basic enforcement activities even though the workload in that area is also increasing somewhat. The committee reduced the request for buildings and facilities by \$604,000 accounted for by deferral of action on planning funds for additional laboratory facilities in the Washington, D.C., area pending a more detailed study

of the possibility of decentralizing such activities.

In the Office of Education the committee approved the budget request for the expanded vocational education program with the exception of the residential schools. The budget request included \$5 million for one residential school to be located in the Washington, D.C., metropolitan area. The committee has added \$5 million to provide for two such schools but has left the location of each open.

The bill includes \$641,750,000 for higher education facilities construction, which is the amount requested in the budget. This will provide for the full amount of construction grants authorized by the basic legislation.

The committee approved the budget request of \$55 million for grants for public libraries. Personally, I cannot understand the action of the Bureau of the Budget in disallowing \$20 million of the \$75 million requested by the Department for this program. The great need for both additional facilities and for additional funds for operation and maintenance of public libraries is obvious to all who will look. State and local matching funds are available to much more than match the \$55 million appropriated for the current fiscal year and most certainly would be available to match an additional \$20 million in 1966.

For both payments to school districts and assistance for school construction in federally impacted areas, the bill includes the full amount estimated by the Office of Education to be necessary to meet 100 percent of entitlements under existing law.

The bill includes \$412,608,000 for defense educational activities. This is the amount requested and in most instances is the full amount authorized for the various programs that fall under this appropriation. The largest part of the increase over the current fiscal year is for the student loan program and for graduate fellowships which were increased \$34,300,000 and \$25 million, respectively, over the amount available for fiscal year 1965. This increase brings both of these programs to the maximum authorized by law.

For educational improvement for the handicapped, the bill also includes the amount of the budget request, \$21,500,000. This is a small amount compared to the need when one considers that it is estimated that over 300,000 teachers are needed for teaching the handicapped whereas there are currently only 60,000 in classrooms.

Another extremely popular program is cooperative research in education. The full amount of the budget, \$25 million, is carried in the bill. While there were many that felt this should be at least \$35 million, the majority of the committee felt that the increase of \$9,160,000, provided in the bill, above the amount appropriated for the current fiscal year should be adequate. For educational research using foreign currencies surplus to the normal needs of the United States, the committee has approved the budget request of \$1 million. In connection with all the special foreign currency programs of the Department, it appears that

considerable progress has been made in improving procedures so that the programs can move forward and accomplish worthwhile results. The committee feels that where worthwhile results are demonstrated, even though the project might be of somewhat lower priority than would be financed with regular appropriations, that it is desirable to proceed with them using foreign currency that would otherwise not be needed for normal requirements of the U.S. Government.

The request for salaries and expenses of the Office of Education included funds to add 151 positions. It is quite obvious that legislation passed by the last Congress requires considerable additional work in 1966 as these programs go into full effect. However, the majority of the committee felt that an adequate job could be done with 100 additional employees. This accounts for the reduction of \$510,000 from the amount of the request.

The vocational rehabilitation program continues to be one of the most popular, one of the most worthwhile, and one of the most profitable of the programs carried out by the Federal Government. In addition to the great and obvious human benefits, it can be mathematically proven that this program returns to the taxpayers several times the number of tax dollars spent on it. The bill includes the full amount of the request for grants to States, research and training—special foreign currency program—and salaries and expenses. The committee has included, in connection with the regular research and training program, \$300,000, not included in the budget, for two special centers, one for the mentally retarded and one for the deaf. The committee also has included \$100,000 for a thorough study of the national needs for vocational rehabilitation and recommendations as to how these needs can best be met. The bill includes \$200,000 more than the \$45,845,000 requested and will expect that the additional \$200,000 be transferred from other activities financed by this appropriation.

The main change that the committee made in the budget for buildings and facilities of the Public Health Service was to add \$1,670,000 for the Laboratory of Perinatal Physiology of the National Institutes of Health in Puerto Rico. Under the budget this total facility would have been built in two stages. Under the provisions of the bill, it can be built in one stage which will be cheaper and will provide the facility at an earlier date.

For injury control, the bill includes \$4,500,000, an increase of \$301,000 over the budget to restore a small portion of the \$1,900,000 by which the Bureau of the Budget reduced the Department's request.

The bill includes \$66,453,000 for chronic diseases and health of the aged. This is an increase of \$5,250,000 over the budget, of which \$3,250,000 is for work in the field of mental retardation. In 1964 the Public Health Service established an advisory group of experts in this field from outside the Federal Government. This group recommended a total of \$5,250,000 more than is contained in the budget. The committee

was surprised that the budget allowed so little in view of the recommendations of this distinguished group of experts. The remaining \$2 million of the increase over the budget is earmarked for work on kidney disease. It has been called to the committee's attention that the report appears to limit the use of these funds to hemodialysis. It was the intention of the committee that dialysis activities be emphasized in connection with this increase, but it is leaving it to the Public Health Service to determine the precise activities to be carried out with these funds which will do the most in meeting the very serious problems of kidney diseases.

The \$8 million reduction recommended below the budget for communicable disease activities represents funds requested for an expanded vaccination program which has not yet been authorized.

Likewise, the reduction of \$3 million in the budget for community health practice and research is for the program of grants for migrant worker health activities for which the legislation has not been extended past 1965.

The bill includes \$259,089,000 for hospital construction activities, which is a reduction of \$44,215,000 from the request. This reduction is brought about primarily as a result of the committee's disallowance of legislative language which would permit the allocation of a much larger amount for modernization than is permitted under the existing law. The budget included \$60 million for modernization, whereas, if the formula in existing law were applied to the total request, only \$14,285,000 could be expended for this purpose. The committee made the adjustment in funds that corresponded with the disallowance of a change in the legislation.

The increase of \$1,634,000 over the budget for air pollution includes \$659,000 to provide sufficient funds to finance as many new research projects in 1966 as are being financed in 1965; and \$975,000 for demonstration projects in control of mine waste fires. The later amount was denied in connection with the Appalachian regional development program since the act authorizing that program did not specifically authorize this activity, whereas it is clearly authorized under the Clean Air Act.

The relatively small increases for environmental engineering and sanitation, occupational health, and radiological health are all to provide sufficient funds to finance as many new research projects in 1966 as are being financed in 1965. The committee cannot understand why the budget sought to cut these relatively new and very important research programs back in the 1966 budget.

The increase recommended by the committee for water supply and water pollution control is \$3,913,000 over the budget. The largest item of increase is \$1,800,000 which was requested in connection with the Appalachian development program but denied since the legislation authorizing that program did not specifically authorize demonstration in acid mine drainage for which these funds were requested. In addition to this, the

committee has added \$1 million to the bill for demonstration grants; \$300,000 to permit 75 percent staffing, instead of 55 percent staffing provided in the budget, for the new regional water pollution control laboratories at Corvallis, Oreg., Ada, Okla., and Athens, Ga.; and \$813,000 to enable the division to finance as many new research projects in 1966 as are being financed in 1965.

The bill includes \$57,710,000, an increase of \$864,000, the amount necessary to keep the Chicago and Memphis hospitals open. The committee would be opposed to closing these hospitals on principle, even if the costs were slightly more than the costs of caring for merchant seamen and other legal beneficiaries on a contract basis. Any possible doubts were resolved when the committee found that it actually would cost the Federal Government \$212,000 less in 1966 to keep these hospitals in operation than it would to close them.

Except for a small reduction of \$80,000 in the request for national health statistics all of the other items in the Public Health Service, except the National Institutes of Health, are carried in the bill in the same amounts as requested in the budget. So unless there are questions regarding them, I will not take the time to discuss each individually.

I was not very happy about the budget for the National Institutes of Health, in fact, I recommended an increase of \$100 million in committee. I have a lot to say about this so I think I will comment on the other items in the bill and then discuss the NIH budget in some detail.

But before I leave the subject of public health, I would like to bring to the attention of the Members of the House something not directly related to this bill. My good friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] recently sent me a new book by Peter Wyden, "The Overweight Society." I was a little amused by it at first, and most people, I think would react the same way. But the time I had finished it, however, I was convinced that this is one of the real public health problems of this Nation today. This is a really good book, in my opinion, and I highly recommend it as "must reading" to anyone with an interest in public health—or, for that matter, interested in their own health.

To get back to the bill—there is a relatively small increase for St. Elizabeths Hospital which simply will allow them to keep their positions filled at the normal rate. No additional positions are provided.

There is a decrease of \$3 million or approximately 1 percent in the request for the Social Security Administration. We believe that they can do an adequate job with the funds allowed.

The largest reduction in the bill is for grants to States for public assistance. The budget request was \$3,242,100,000 and the bill includes an even \$3 billion. This is less than 6 percent below the appropriation for 1965 and as stated in the report, it would seem that this should be a very modest reduction to expect in view of the expansion of programs under the Social Security Amendments of 1962, that were aimed at reducing dependency, and in view of all of the

other programs that are also aimed at doing this, such as the vocational rehabilitation program, the antipoverty program, the Appalachian program, and so forth.

The committee also made a reduction in salaries and expenses of the Bureau of Family Services but has allowed 20 of the 45 new positions requested.

The reduction for juvenile delinquency and youth offenses represents the disallowance of all of the activities for which there is no authorization in 1966, and limiting funds for the activities that are authorized to just the amount required in 1966.

Of the remaining programs under the Welfare Administration, the committee is recommending a reduction of \$203,000 for the Office of Aging; is recommending \$1,882,000, a reduction of \$118,000 from the request for cooperative research or demonstration projects; and has disallowed \$116,000 requested by the Office of the Commissioner for the establishment of regional coordinator for welfare programs and a secretary in each of seven regional offices. There is no change from the budget for the other items.

The bill includes \$1 million for the American Printing House for the Blind which is sufficient to allow \$50 per blind pupil. This is \$91,000 more than the request but is based on testimony by the vice president and general manager of the American Printing House for the Blind that \$50 is the minimum amount necessary to provide the available educational materials that these pupils should have. The budget request was approved in each instance for the other items appearing under "special institutions."

For all items appearing under the heading, "Office of the Secretary," the bill includes \$19,969,000 which is a reduction of \$3,222,000 below the request. Most of this reduction is accounted for by a reduction of \$3 million for educational television facilities. The hearings and material submitted to the committee indicates that the \$8,826,000 included for these activities in the bill will be all that will be required during the year.

The only change from the budget request for the related agencies was a small reduction of \$42,000 for the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service. This leaves that agency \$6,610,000 or \$276,000 more than the 1965 appropriation.

#### NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH

As I mentioned earlier, I was most unhappy with the NIH budget. The estimates submitted on behalf of the National Institutes of Health were again totally inadequate this year. There was no allowance whatever for any new advances on major disease problems. There was no allowance for the intensification of any of the existing research programs—even in areas where both urgent need and challenging opportunity are clearly evident. There was not even adequate provision for maintaining the momentum of present efforts to solve the fully identified problems whose solution

could save thousands of lives and prevent uncountable days of pain and misery.

The administration's request for the National Institutes of Health was not even a good hold-the-line budget—and a hold-the-line budget is simply not good enough for an agency whose activities so vitally affect the future health and welfare of all the American people.

I can wholeheartedly support the President's goals for a Great Society but I cannot understand a program for achieving a Great Society which does not have as one of its primary aims the elimination of the scourge of disease, the tragedy of mental retardation and all other forms of congenital disabilities, and the ever-present threat of untimely death. What can possibly be of more importance to a Great Society than the health of its citizens? What is going on when the President speaks of a healthy citizenry as one of this country's foremost goals and the Bureau of the Budget restricts and reduces the budget estimates of the agency which is at the forefront of the toughest battle we face—the battle to conquer man's most ancient, most relentless and most personal enemy—disease?

The attitude of the Bureau of the Budget seems doubly capricious because it flies in the face of its own assessment of the level of Federal support needed merely to keep pace with the rising cost of doing research. It has recently been well publicized that the Bureau of the Budget regards an annual increase of 15 percent as the minimum necessary to keep existing programs going. This figure is also contained in the report of the Panel on Basic Research and National Goals set up by the National Academy of Sciences at the request of the Congress.

About 5 percent of this increase is due to the normal rise in the cost of doing business experienced by almost every flourishing enterprise. It represents increases in salaries, wages, and the price of supplies. Most of the increased cost of ongoing research, however, is due to the greater complexity of the work being done—to the higher cost of more effective and more accurate instruments and of meeting the more exacting demands of modern research methods.

As the committee's report on the bill points out, an electron microscope is 100 times as expensive as an ordinary microscope; electronic devices become more costly as greater accuracy is demanded from them; the application of computers to research problems introduces a new and significant cost factor; germ-free animals are a necessary, expensive replacement for ordinary mice, rats, and guinea pigs. The 15-percent figure adopted by the Bureau of the Budget is not adequate to take care of all the real needs of medical research—it is a minimum figure which does not pretend to do more than just keep the present level of research from slowing down for lack of funds.

Yet what does the Bureau of the Budget do when it comes to the estimates for the National Institutes of Health? Does it allow the increase of 15 percent that it has set as the necessary minimum?

It does not. For medical research—which is of vital concern to every man, woman, and child and which has the full support of the American people—the budget allows only half of this minimum increase.

There is no justification for the arbitrary limitation imposed on the NIH budget estimates. The effectiveness of the NIH programs are universally recognized. Its contributions to the advancement of medicine have been outstanding—not merely through the work supported by the grant-in-aid programs, but through the work done by its own scientists. The dedicated men who work in Bethesda and in the field stations of NIH in various parts of the world have run up an impressive score of research accomplishments ranging from such specific achievements as finding a cure for Rocky Mountain spotted fever, which used to be a fast-striking and fatal disease, to such dramatic breakthroughs as the cracking of the genetic code which opens the way to the unraveling of the causes of a whole host of genetic diseases.

The record of the scientists whose work NIH has supported is no less impressive. There is hardly a major advance in medical research—or in the scientific disciplines which contribute to the understanding of medical problems—that is not directly or indirectly indebted to the grant programs of the NIH.

A thorough review of the NIH programs has just been conducted, at the request of the President, by a distinguished committee, under the chairmanship of Dr. Dean Wooldridge. This committee and its advisory panels—involving 77 prominent scientists and administrators—appraised the extramural projects supported by NIH in 37 universities, medical schools, hospitals, and research institutions. The group made detailed investigations and evaluations of some 400 separate activities supported by NIH covering each of its major program areas. As a result of this exhaustive review, the Wooldridge committee stated in its report to the President that:

The first and probably most important general conclusion of the study is that the activities of the National Institutes of Health are essentially sound and that its budget of approximately \$1 billion a year is, on the whole, being spent wisely and well in the public interest.

Not only did the Wooldridge committee find that the vast majority of research supported by NIH is of high quality but it emphasizes that the NIH activities "have greatly improved the quality and quantity of both research and teaching in our biomedical institutions." I have been much concerned over this question of quality for a number of years but have not found one shred of evidence to suggest that there has been any decline at all in the quality of the research supported by NIH as its appropriations grew larger. I am therefore not at all surprised but I am very much heartened by the statement of the Wooldridge committee not only that it had found no evidence of a lowering of quality but that it found "good evidence that the average quality is steadily improving." In

fact, the committee's report puts it more strongly than that; it says that usually "NIH-supported work was found to set the national or international standard of excellence in its field."

In other words, instead of asking how the NIH programs stack up against other research programs we might better ask how other programs stack up against the high standards set by NIH.

The Wooldridge committee clearly states its conclusion that the NIH appropriations "constitute a sound investment for the American people." I think my constituents—and taxpayers everywhere—will be glad to hear the final sentence of the report's section on the quality of the NIH activities. The Wooldridge committee says:

We suspect that there are few, if any, \$1 billion segments of the Federal budget that are buying more valuable services for the American people than that administered by the National Institutes of Health.

It would be helpful if the Bureau of the Budget would take note of the observation by this group of distinguished citizens that "greater expenditures for health research are yielding greater progress in the alleviation of disease" and its recommendation that new opportunities for health research "should be exploited with the enthusiasm and vigor which has distinguished the NIH program during the past decade." If these words could be posted on the desks of the people who have to approve the NIH estimates before they are put into the President's budget, the Congress might get a more realistic and more forward-looking appropriation request for these important programs.

For nearly 10 years the executive branch has been shirking its responsibility for developing a vigorous and forward-moving national health-research effort. Instead of encouraging and supporting those directly responsible for the NIH programs, it has tried to put these officials under wraps and to prevent them from giving the Appropriations Committee straight, unbiased answers to questions involving their professional judgment on the proper course for the development of these programs. As a result, the Congress has had to take the initiative in expanding these programs. This is recognized by the Wooldridge committee which says in its report:

The Congress in particular deserves considerable credit for its past and continuing support of this kind of farsighted program.

The Congress can—and should—continue to push and to prod, but it cannot undertake to make professional scientific assessments of new research opportunities; it cannot determine the most desirable balance of effort among the many fields that need further development; it cannot do the detailed planning of program needs that should be reflected in the budget estimates.

The committee has probed deeply into the opportunities for carrying forward the fight against the major crippling diseases and the leading causes of premature death in the United States. It has inquired into the unmet program needs of the National Institutes of Health not only as viewed by the capable

officials responsible for these programs but as seen by many of this country's leading medical scientists. The conclusion is inescapable that with the budget estimates submitted by the executive branch the NIH could not march forward but would be forced to spend a year simply marching in place.

In the absence of the forward-looking budget justifications which it has a right to expect—and which it will certainly insist upon next year—the committee has included no general increases for any of the National Institutes of Health in the bill. It has, however, provided specific increases, totaling \$11,700,000, for six special programs that are so important to the future health of the American people that it would be intolerable to wait another year in the hope that the Bureau of the Budget might see fit to include them.

These six programs are described in some detail in the committee's report on the bill but they may be briefly summarized.

The bill includes an increase of \$2.5 million for work on the development of an artificial heart. Such a device will make possible treatments not possible with the present heart-lung machine which is only effective for the relatively short time required by a single operation. It is hoped that this program will ultimately lead to the development of a compact and reliable mechanism that can be used as a permanent replacement for an incurably damaged heart.

The bill includes an increase of \$2 million for perfecting the artificial kidney and bringing it within reach of a larger number of people who suffer from kidney failure. Much additional research is also needed on the nature of kidney failure if the machine is to be successfully applied to a broader range of patients than is now possible. Practically nothing was included in the budget for this important work.

The bill includes an increase of \$1,650,000 for a task force on breast cancer which is still the most common form of cancer in women and for which the mortality figures have not improved over the last several years. The committee is convinced that something can, and must, be done about this unsatisfactory situation for which the budget made no adequate provision.

The bill includes an increase of \$2,300,000 for the second year of the study on the effect of drugs on coronary thrombosis. Although the Congress appropriated funds last year especially for this program, the Bureau of the Budget took it upon itself to withhold these funds from the Heart Institute until about 6 weeks ago and struck the request for funds for the second year of this program from the budget for fiscal 1966. This is a flagrant example not only of the irresponsibility of the Bureau of the Budget but of its complete failure to respond to the determination of the Congress and of the American people to press the war on disease with all the vigor possible.

The bill also restores \$2 million for the cancer training program which was gratuitously deleted by the Bureau of the Budget as an economy measure.

Some major modifications in this program have been proposed by the Cancer Institute to improve its effectiveness in providing special training in the diagnosis and the treatment of cancer. These plans were seized on by the Bureau of the Budget as justification for an economy cut in the estimates. The committee has heard no evidence—and can hardly imagine any—that this is the sort of program on which the American people want to economize.

The bill provides an increase of \$1,250,000 for the Division of Computer Research and Technology which is being set up at NIH. The application of advanced computer techniques to clinical medicine and to laboratory research opens up important new avenues for progress not only in the understanding of biological processes but in the treatment of patients. The computer is destined to become as important an adjunct to the operating room as the X-ray machine. The facilities at NIH and the broad competence of its staff furnishes an excellent setting for developmental work in this very promising new field.

I think it is important to note that certain of these new programs, for which the bill makes special provision, reflect two important trends in the further scientific and technical aspects of NIH programs.

First, it is now possible to undertake, with a high degree of confidence, the pursuit of very specific objectives relating to diagnostic and therapeutic approaches to disease problems and to organize for the development of such devices as artificial kidneys and external support mechanisms for the heart. This capability results from the ever-increasing body of knowledge concerning life and disease processes which is flowing from the broad base of research activities supported over the past 15 years in the biomedical sciences. Thus we can now undertake with the hope of very practical results the application of this broad base of knowledge to the solution of particular disease problems and the development of specific devices and systems to support or replace physiological processes and organs.

Second, we are now witnessing the growing transfer of the advances in the physical sciences, and relating engineering and technical capability, to the field of medical research and the provision of health services. The current scene in the biomedical sciences is characterized by an exhilarating interplay between the technology and concepts of the physical sciences and the problems of biology and medicine. New fields of activity are emerging in such areas as biomedical engineering, medical electronics, bioinstrumentation and so forth.

These trends are now being reflected in the program and budgetary needs of the National Institutes of Health. These activities bring with them two new requirements. Conduct of programs of this character require greater control over the course of technical activity and access to new kinds of scientific and technical talent. As a consequence of these requirements the National Institutes of Health will have to make more extensive use of

the contract as the instrument of choice in the support of research and will be engaged on an increasing scale with private industry as a source of new kinds of scientific engineering and technological skills.

These are important developments into which the committee inquired at some depth during the course of the hearings. Pages 822 through 830 of the hearing volume provides detailed description of what is taking place in this area. The Public Health Service, in testifying before the committee in connection with these developments, noted that the administration had submitted to the Congress legislation to broaden the authority of the Surgeon General to enter into contracts for research and development activities. This legislation encompassed in H.R. 2984 has recently been reported by the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

It is a matter of considerable concern to the Appropriations Committee that the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee has recommended substantial modifications in the request of the Public Health Service for contract authority. The modifications recommended include limiting the use of this contract authority for a 3-year period and establishing an appropriation ceiling of \$43 million. While I understand the interest of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee to establish clear limits on the use of authority in this area, I am concerned that the particular actions in this respect may intervene to prevent the accomplishment of many of these important objectives in the field of medical research. The appropriation limit of \$43 million recommended by the committee happens to be the actual level of obligations for contracts incurred by the National Institutes of Health in fiscal year 1964. The limitation on the other hand applies to the entire Public Health Service and seems to take no account of the fact that the planned expenditures in this area under the President's budget for fiscal year 1966 would exceed some \$90 million. Thus the effect of this amendment to H.R. 2984 would be to cut back the Public Health Service research contract activities to well below last year's level and effectively stop further development of this program.

It also has a further most serious consequence. It is DHEW policy to restrict support for research in non-profit-making organizations to the use of the contract. Thus the kind of limitation that is encompassed within the present amendments to H.R. 2984 has the effect of barring the field of medical research to private industry just at the moment when the development of medical sciences is such that effective use can be made of great technological capability and skill now present in the aerospace industry and other areas of private industry. This restriction will prevent access to this great resource. I hope it is possible in the coming debate on this bill to explore this matter in order that the action of the House will indeed reflect our concern with the proper use of legis-

lative authority but will not arbitrarily forestall a course of research development in biomedicine of great significance or deny private industry its appropriate role in this evolution.

The general provisions of the bill include a modification of section 203 providing for the payment of the indirect costs of research projects.

The committee believes that the costs of research legitimately include not only those costs which are solely attributable to the research project but also those general operating and administrative costs that do not arise from any single activity but are essential to all the activities of the institution. The committee believes that the distinction between direct cost and indirect cost is necessarily somewhat arbitrary and rather meaningless. It is the committee's view that the so-called indirect costs are part of the proper and inescapable costs of all of the institution's activities, including research.

The committee believes that Federal research-support funds should be available for any legitimate expense of eligible research projects and that arbitrary distinctions between one kind of cost and another should not enter into the calculation of the support which the Federal Government is willing to provide.

However, we should not lose sight of the fact that the grant-in-aid concept assumes that the grantor is assisting the grantee in the accomplishment of some piece of work of mutual interest. The principal justification for the grant mechanism—and its principal distinction from research contracts—is that it deals with research projects which arise from the professional or institutional interests of members of the scientific community. Federal support is made available to them because—and only to the extent that—these projects also serve important national interests which the Federal Government is anxious to promote.

In these circumstances, it is not only fair but proper that the grantee institution be expected to bear some proportion of the cost. This principle is, in fact, included in the enabling legislation for several grant programs in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare such as the cooperative research or demonstration projects of the Welfare Administration, the cooperative research in education of the Office of Education, and the grants for special projects of the Educational Rehabilitation Administration. It is also observed in practice in the extensive NIH grant programs. With few exceptions, the NIH grants do not pay the salary of the principal investigator on the project supported nor do they normally provide payment for the cost of all the equipment used in carrying out the project.

The provision in the bill that the funds appropriated shall not be used to pay the full cost of grant-supported projects therefore does not mark a radical departure from present practice. On the contrary, the committee hopes that the abolition of the artificial distinction between direct and indirect costs will lead to a simpler and more equitable deter-

mination of the amount which the Federal Government will contribute to grant-supported projects.

The committee has not sought to establish any detailed guidelines for the calculation of the full cost of research and it has left the door open for determining the extent of Federal participation on either a project-by-project or an institutional basis. The committee is only concerned, on the one hand, that the principle of financial participation by the grantee in the work supported should be maintained, and, on the other hand, that the Federal Government should minimize the burden on the already strained resources of most universities and other research institutions by providing the maximum proportion of the total cost of grant-supported research that is justifiable in the particular circumstances, so long as it involves at least some participation by the grantee institution.

Mr. Chairman, those are the highlights of the bill and the changes that have been made in the budget after 3 months' work of the committee to determine what is in the best interest of all the people of the country.

Mr. Chairman, everything considered, this is a good bill. If I were writing it myself there are a great many changes I would make. But I know compromise is necessary in practically all legislation. That this bill represents a good compromise is illustrated by the fact that this bill is unanimously reported. I hope and trust that the House will adopt it overwhelmingly.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I shall be glad to yield to my friend, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross].

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

This bill is almost \$8 billion, \$7.9-some-odd billion.

How much does the gentleman think his committee can hold this to when they come around to the supplemental appropriations stage later on, some months from now?

Mr. FOGARTY. In the first place, I do not know what the supplementals are going to be. It is the plan of the committee, as I understand it at the present time, to hold hearings about the third week in May on an overall supplemental bill confined to the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare. This is going to be a sizable supplemental bill.

We hope to have it on the floor about the middle of June. It is going to be sizable because of the medical care bill, the Manpower Development and Training Act that was passed, the education bill which was passed, and four or five others including the antipoverty program. Hearings are going to be held on all of them during the third or fourth week of May.

What the administration is going to send up in some of these areas we do not know.

Mr. GROSS. They are going to get up some sizable figures. The gentleman talked earlier in his presentation, which was an excellent presentation, about the fact we are going to get more



of these items in the supplemental. This bill would be a good deal more than \$8 billion, would it not?

Mr. FOGARTY. This bill is going to grow and grow and grow and grow, and I think it should.

Mr. GROSS. That leads me to ask this question: What progress has been made in heart and cancer research and its affliction for the enormous amount of money that has been spent for research in this field?

Mr. FOGARTY. I am not a physician, as the gentleman knows. We do have physicians in the House. In addition we have listened to hundreds of them in the past 10 or 15 years, some of the best in the world, because we think we have some of the best doctors in the world, many who are specialists in heart and cancer. They tell us that because of the advances in heart surgery, over the last 4 or 5 years, untold thousands of people are walking around today who otherwise could not have survived their heart ailments.

In the area of cancer, even though the numbers dying seem to be increasing, I think it is estimated that 290,000 will die this year because of some form of cancer, the reason for this increase given to us on the committee, is that the Nation's population is increasing by leaps and bounds every year. One of the reasons for this increase is that people live longer now. As a result, the longer people live the greater the chance that they will get some form of heart trouble or some form of cancer. However, in cancer substantial progress has been made. As we understand it, if people would go to their doctor in time, much could be done to help save lives from cancer today because of the new knowledge we have. Whereas 20 years ago one out of four was being saved, or one of five, it is now up to one out of three. If they went to their own doctor in time perhaps one in two could be saved. That is, if they went to their doctor in time, if they heeded the danger signals that are put out by the American Cancer Society, and by the medical profession, in this way additional lives could be saved.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. DENTON. I want to commend the gentleman for bringing forth a very good bill. I believe every Member of the House knows the interest and the work that the chairman has engaged in, in connection with public health, medical research, care for the aged, retarded children, and education and welfare generally. The bill does not appropriate as much money as the chairman thinks it should, or as much as I think it should, but it is a good bill and we are supporting it. I want to thank him again for this fine bill.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. I read the discussion on the general provisions involving the indirect cost of research projects appearing on page 54. I would like to ask the

gentleman a question concerning section 203 of the general provisions of the Appropriations Act. As I understand it, the committee is removing the 20-percent limitation on indirect costs with the condition that grantee institutions must share in the full costs, both direct and indirect, of supported research. Is that correct?

Mr. FOGARTY. That is correct up to maybe an average of 5 percent.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. It is also the committee's expectation that the Bureau of the Budget, in promulgating regulations for appropriate levels of financial participation for grantees, will be guided by the principle that an institution should share in supported research costs in proportion to the degree to which the institution is benefited locally in its teaching, research, and other institutional responsibilities.

Mr. FOGARTY. We are going to leave that up to the Bureau of the Budget. We are lumping, as the gentleman so well knows, the indirect costs and training costs, and we expect the Bureau of the Budget to come up with a formula so that all of these grantees would be participating to the extent of perhaps an average of 5 percent.

And I understand the national groups are supporting this provision in the bill. The Daddario committee, for one, has looked into it, and I think the committee of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOUNTAIN] has looked into it, too, and the Elliott committee—and they have made similar recommendations.

I cannot mention the Daddario committee without a comment about its great chairman. He is one of the most able Members of this House and did a magnificent job as chairman of that committee.

We have come up with this proposal with the understanding that it is also going to be in the independent offices bill and in the Department of Defense appropriation bill. These are the three large bills where most of the research grant funds are carried.

But it is my understanding that these institutions are happy and satisfied with this proposal as it is now written.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. But it is the committee's feeling that these institutions should share in the support of research costs in proportion to the degree to which the institutions are benefited locally in these various areas?

Mr. FOGARTY. Yes, if it is feasible.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. I want to commend the gentleman and his subcommittee as well as the full committee for what I believe is a sound approach to this problem.

The impression has been created in some quarters that university research costs automatically become a responsibility of the Federal Government when the Government contributes to their support. Fortunately, this misleading notion has been challenged by eminent bodies in the educational field, such as the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, which recognize that scholarly work of a professor's own choosing is as much a part of his institutional duties as his teaching.

I think it should recognize, at the same time, that there are some federally supported research projects administered by certain universities and other institutions which are truly national in character. I believe provision should be made in these special cases for full Federal funding, particularly when the research projects are very costly undertakings.

Mr. FOGARTY. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SISK. I want to congratulate and compliment the gentleman and his committee on the great job they have done. I, too, agree with the gentleman that some of these figures, in my opinion, should be higher because I think we need to be spending more money particularly in the health field.

I want to ask briefly a question with reference to his comments regarding the educational TV facilities program. It is my understanding, and I am not taking this time to be critical, that the \$3 million that was cut from the request was because the indications were that the States would not be in a position to use the money; is that correct?

Mr. FOGARTY. That is correct.

Mr. SISK. I bring this up because I have been very much interested in this education TV program.

Mr. FOGARTY. We think it is a good program but the funds are not being used this year and my own State, I might say, has not taken advantage of this.

Mr. SISK. That was the point I wanted to briefly touch upon. My own State has a number of applications pending. In fact, my own hometown has one ready to go and there is a shortage of funds. It is my understanding that under the law there was a limit beyond which any State could go. I assume that is the gentleman's interpretation?

Mr. FOGARTY. That is right.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, while I hope and expect that this House will approve the committee's recommendation for an appropriation of \$8,826,000 to continue financing our national education television program, I consider it deplorable and an evidence of a technical defect in the authorizing legislation that we are not considering instead the full \$11,826,000 recommended by the President for this vital educational service.

It is evident that the only reason the committee cannot justify the larger amount lies in the State allocation provisions of the authorizing legislation. This means that many qualified applicants will be denied matching grants, not on the merits of their applications or the need for their educational services, but only because they are in States which already have utilized the amounts allocated to that State.

For example, in my State of California, there are at least five qualified educational television groups prepared to serve major segments of our school population, but California's share of Federal funds is nearing exhaustion and cannot possibly provide matching grants for these

enterprises, into which local citizens are prepared to put substantial sums.

I do not want to deprive any State of a full opportunity to participate in this program. They should be encouraged to do so. But if any State cannot usefully spend its entire allocation within a reasonable period of time, I firmly believe the remaining sum should revert for reallocation to those States having qualified applicants whose needs cannot be funded under the original allocation. If this were now the law, the entire \$11,826,000 would be urgently needed and could be fully justified.

I have talked with the chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee about the possibility of hearings to explore how this educational television program is progressing. I am hopeful the committee will get into this important subject, and if it does so, I shall certainly strongly urge a revision of the authorization along the lines I have discussed.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I think it is the general consensus in this body that the gentleman from Rhode Island is one of the great legislators of the House of Representatives and certainly one of the best informed men in the United States on health and education. It is always a pleasure to hear him bring this bill to the floor of the House.

Mr. Chairman, I want particularly to compliment him and all who share responsibility for the decision, as reflected by the terms of this bill, to provide the funds to begin implementation of section 14 in Public Law 88-210—the section wisely enacted by the 88th Congress to provide Federal assistance in the establishment of residential vocational training schools to meet a very urgent need for such facilities across the Nation.

Chairman FOGARTY and the members of his subcommittee, backed by the full committee, have recommended that funds be provided to assure at least two pilot institutions in this field—a field in which the Congress has already authorized five pilot institutions.

I believe the committee's recommendation should have the full support of this body, and there should be no further delay in the program.

I also hope and trust that the committee's recommendations will be heard on the subject of where and how this great program can best be initiated.

No witness appearing before the committee was more effective in presenting the case for residential vocational education than the able director of the Oklahoma State Technical School at Okmulgee, Okla., Wayne W. Miller.

Mr. Miller has been associated with the Okmulgee school for 12 years, and his experience ranges from department head to director.

His testimony appears in the hearings on this legislation, and I commend its reading to you.

The unvarnished, undeniable truth is that residential vocational training is the proven road to reduction of unemploy-

ment and welfare burdens for the Nation, and every dollar invested in it will return many dollars in the future. The dollars returned will not only be in tax payments from persons who have been tax loads for the community—but also in many other ways which appear in Mr. Miller's experience and are covered in his testimony. Residential vocational education is the proven road to enrichment of the family, the community, and the Nation.

Oklahoma State University's School of Technical Training, popularly known as Oklahoma State Tech, was established at Okmulgee following World War II, utilizing the facilities of a surplus army hospital to meet a great postwar need for vocational education.

It has steadily grown through the years, and has more than 1,200 students residing in school housing at this time. More than 20,000 former students are today in productive employment at good wages as a result of this school's work, and its dedicated faculty of 105, teaching 33 vocations, provide perhaps this Nation's finest corps of vocational instructors.

The city of Okmulgee, once the capitol of the Creek Nation in Indian territory days, today provides an ideal site for the school, the people of the community have given it their enthusiastic, wholehearted support through the years.

Okmulgee is centrally located to serve the major population concentration of Indians in our country, and Indians from virtually every State have come to Okmulgee to benefit from the program of Oklahoma State Tech.

The remarkable achievements of the adult vocational training program for Indians, as reported by Area Director Virgil Harrington of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, have been realized in large part through utilization of the Oklahoma State Tech facilities.

Director Harrington's figures indicate that 92 percent of the Indians receiving training at Oklahoma State Tech—regardless of whether they completed their training course or not—have been given job opportunities through their training. Every graduate of the training program was placed in his field of training or a related field. This is a remarkable record, in a group of our people with an unusually high dropout rate in school and unusually high incidence of unemployment and economic distress.

In one demonstration of what could be done, seven Indian mothers who were heads of families and receiving aid for dependent children were enrolled as vocational students at Oklahoma State Tech.

On completion of training, all but two were able to be self-sufficient. Within 5 years, the savings in aid for dependent children payments will more than pay the cost of training for all seven of these Indian mothers.

The Bureau of Indian Affairs at Muskogee has indicated it could refer "a minimum of 1,000 Indians" to receive vocational training at Okmulgee, from the several States which make up the Muskogee area alone, if funds and facilities were available.

Additional thousands of Indians could be expected to take advantage of the program, from other areas of the southwest, midwest and north, if a pilot school were established at Okmulgee in accordance with this legislation.

In no sense of the word, however, is the Oklahoma school a school for Indians alone.

On the contrary, Indian students have always been in the minority, and students of all races are included in the present enrollment. There are 28 States represented by students at Okmulgee today, and 8 foreign countries have sent students to take advantage of the institution's program.

In the Nation today, no other location has more to offer as a site for a pilot residential vocational education program than Okmulgee, Okla.

I believe this fact is recognized by the professional leaders of vocational education, both in the Department and across the country. I am highly pleased that members of the subcommittee which heard testimony on this matter have frankly expressed their conviction that Okmulgee is an ideal location for this program. I hope and trust the funds will be approved and a pilot program will soon be underway at Oklahoma State Tech.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, it is a pleasure to join with the gentleman from Oklahoma, Congressman EDMONDSON, and other members of the Oklahoma delegation in supporting the establishment of a pilot residential vocational school under Public Law 88-210 at Oklahoma State Tech in Okmulgee.

With more than 100 experienced instructors on its campus, the Okmulgee school is in a splendid position to utilize an additional Federal investment wisely. Figures supplied to me indicate that more than 1,200 students are already living in campus housing at Okmulgee.

The student body at Okmulgee State Tech already represents a cross section of the American people with students from 28 of the States in the Union and 8 foreign countries. They are enrolled in 40 vocational-technical courses ranging from the skilled crafts to highly complex courses in modern electronics.

Within our State, as well as in the Nation, this school has been meeting a widespread need for residential vocational training.

Seventy-six of Oklahoma's seventy-seven counties are represented by students at Oklahoma State Tech, and the school is highly respected by employers throughout the State for the quality of its student product.

I hope the funds provided in this bill will be approved and the Oklahoma State Tech facilities and faculty can be a part of our growing effort to prepare our high school dropouts and unskilled

young people for the difficult task of making a living in today's complex society.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. I wish to join the compliments on this 18th presentation of this budget by the gentleman from Rhode Island on the various agencies, particularly of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the National Institutes of Health.

I rise to associate myself with the remarks of the chairman, as well as those made by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOUNTAIN].

In that connection I note with particular interest—because this is a field in which I used to work—the addition to the budget, along with other judicious paring, for the National Institutes of Health, especially the Heart Institute, for breakthroughs in the work on the artificial heart, kidney, and such areas as recycling of foods and water in space; by private industry.

As a result of being on the research and development subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee, and of being one of the three physicians in the Congress, I have had unusual knowledge of the heart boosters, as well as the artificial heart, to say nothing about the heart-lung bypass systems, in private life, because of work in a foundation which we established before I came to the Congress.

With the research and development features—new sensors and pulsors and devices now available to the engineers as well as to those who do basic and allied research—there has been a distinct breakthrough. This has happened in private business and industry, as the gentleman so well said in his opening statement.

As to manned space flight, bioastronautics, and other activities, this is an area to which the Government should give support. We should not limit ourselves to what I think of as the vertical research, which refers back to the remarks of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOUNTAIN] in which we necessarily duplicate and must build on the building blocks: basic, then applied research, then developmental engineering, design, prototype, et cetera. We should work simultaneously on these in the area of horizontal research and development since the applied researcher must have the engineer design the gadget for him, anyway. We should develop all this simultaneously, and then make the horizontal breakthrough needed, whether it be on cancer research, heart research, or whatnot. That will come, because the breakthrough cannot be found alone with money and additional personnel. We are more liable to find the answer to cancer in clinical and/or bedside research than in the ivory towers of the vertical approach.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. FOGARTY. I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I should like to join my distinguished colleague from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON] in commending the chairman of the subcommittee and the Appropriations Committee.

Ask any vocational educator where Okmulgee, Okla., is, and he will tell you. He will also tell you of the outstanding vocational school there, Oklahoma State Tech, which is the vocational-technical branch of Oklahoma State University.

The success of this school is a tribute to its founders and its leadership. Since it was established 18 years ago, it has never lost sight of its principal purpose for being—to turn out skilled craftsmen and technicians. Because it has held to this purpose, the school has compiled an outstanding record. It has taken young Indians from reservations and taught them skills, and it has taught them to live and work in society. Its record in vocational rehabilitation of the handicapped is one of the best anywhere. It has done equally well with high school dropouts, and with ordinary young people seeking training to enable them to work for a good living.

For these and many other reasons, I urge that section 14 of Public Law 88-210 be funded, and that Oklahoma State Tech be designated as a pilot residential vocational school under provisions of the act.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Chairman, Oklahoma State Tech, at Okmulgee, Okla., is the vocational-technical branch of Oklahoma State University.

The outstanding job already being done by this technical school has been recognized by the State board for vocational education, the Oklahoma Vocational Association, and the American Vocational Association.

The work already being done at Okmulgee is one of the best arguments I know for funding section 14 of Public Law 88-210. Thousands of successful graduates of this school can testify to the job which its able faculty is capable of doing, and we know that the school has helped to reduce the welfare load in every county of our State, by making taxpaying citizens out of welfare cases who had no vocational skills.

We believe this school can do an even greater job for the Nation if the money provided by this bill is wisely invested in additional facilities, equipment and faculty at Oklahoma State Tech. We urge this course of action.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, on a small campus in Okmulgee, Okla., in buildings which once housed a World War II military hospital, one of the finest vocational education schools in the Nation has been turning out skilled craftsmen and technicians for 18 years.

The school, Oklahoma State Tech, is a branch of Oklahoma State University at Stillwater. Tech was created to serve the needs of veterans returning from World War II, and it served them well. Now it trains other Oklahomans—and, indeed, many from other States and foreign countries—and its reputation for turning

out skilled and willing workers spreads wherever these young people go.

Oklahoma State Tech is a residential school, where students from all walks of life come to live together and work together and learn together. The school is doing an outstanding job, and a look at its record is a convincing argument for funding section 14 of Public Law 88-210 which provides for establishment of pilot residential vocational training schools. And Oklahoma State Tech would be an ideal location for such a pilot school. It is in operation, it is successful, and the return on investment in this school would be high and satisfying. It is a pleasure to join with my colleagues in urging establishment of a pilot school under Public Law 88-210 in Okmulgee.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, every Oklahoman is proud of the job which has been done during the past 18 years by Oklahoma State Tech at Okmulgee. This fine school is a branch of Oklahoma State University at Stillwater, and was established initially to serve the needs of World War II veterans. The outstanding job which it has done as a regional training center for vocational rehabilitation students, and its effective trade and vocational educational programs for both men and women, have already won for it nationwide recognition.

Vocational educators from all over the country and indeed from foreign countries come to Okmulgee to study the operation of this great institution.

At no other location in the country could the Government invest funds for a pilot residential vocational program with greater economy of initial investment, and with a higher assurance of return on the investment than at Oklahoma State Tech. I am pleased to join other members of the Oklahoma delegation in urging that funds be approved for the establishment of a pilot training institution under the Vocational Education Act at Okmulgee.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Chairman, it is my privilege to support this bill which is being so ably handled by our colleague from Rhode Island.

I am particularly interested in the fact that the committee this year has eliminated the percentage ceiling on reimbursable overhead costs relative to Federal research grants which has been carried in prior appropriations bills.

In my judgment this makes a good deal of sense.

The committee has, on the other hand, inserted a requirement in section 203 that at least some of the costs of the research projects involved in Federal grants be borne by the grantee institutions. While I do not feel competent at this point to say whether the method adopted by the committee is the best one, it does appear to me to be a move in the logical direction.

In fact, both actions taken by the Appropriations Committee in this bill are similar to the conclusions reached by the Committee on Science and Astronautics and its Subcommittee on Science, Research, and Development, which I have the honor to chair. In House Report No. 144, issued by our committee

earlier this year, and following extensive hearings by the subcommittee last summer, recommendations were made that first, percentage limitations on indirect costs be removed, and second, that beginning efforts be made to establish criteria for cost sharing based on the mutual interests of institutional grantees and Federal grantor agencies.

I am pleased and impressed to find the approach in the bill before us today indicating that the Appropriations Committee, quite independently, has reached conclusions not greatly different.

We are all, I think, striving toward the same goals. In essence, they are as quoted by the report on this bill—worthwhile research, adequately supervised and economically conducted. One could hardly find a more succinct summarization of that which we seek in making Federal grants for scientific research.

Mr. Chairman, the net effect of this language in the bill will be to make the Budget Bureau's directive—Circular A-21—on the assessment of reimbursable overhead apply to HEW research grants. This directive has been carefully worked out over a number of years and seeks to safeguard the fiscal interests of both the Government and the grantee institutions. Simultaneously, it will mean that some thought will be given to the equities involved in cost sharing—but as a separate issue and not as a complicating offshoot of the overhead problem.

In my opinion this is as it should be.

I should like to thank the committee and its chairman for giving their thoughtful attention to a complex and important problem.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I am gratified that the report on the appropriations bill for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare recognizes two matters of importance to both Chicago and the Nation. The first pertains to water pollution control studies. The second insures the continued accessibility of Public Health Service hospital facilities.

In discussing the Federal Water Quality Act of 1965, I noted that there is nothing more local than a drop of water and nothing more national than what we do with it. Slowly but surely we are learning what to do with water, our most important natural resource. We are learning to conserve it, to purify it, to reuse it, to control it. The demonstration grants provided under the water supply and water pollution control appropriation give us an opportunity to learn more in the vital areas of water reuse, drainage, pollution, and flood control.

The Bureau of the Budget asked that only \$1,165,000 be spent for such projects in 1966. That would be only enough to finance 25 projects already underway, and would not allow funds for any new projects. Fortunately, the subcommittee recognized the benefits to be realized in such programs and added \$1 million to the bill for demonstration grants. This means that many more projects, some of them already approved, can get underway this year, and the country will be better for it.

One of these new projects represents an imaginative new approach to water pollution, flood control, and sanitation. It is proposed for a 25-square-mile area on the South Side of Chicago. If it is found workable, it could provide a good answer to water pollution caused by storms in urban areas throughout the United States. Specifically, this project calls for a \$125,000 feasibility study of a storm drainage system incorporating a network of huge underground tunnels. Engineers suggest that such an approach could eliminate storm water overflows into Lake Michigan, keep polluted storm flows from the Chicago River and drainage canals, eliminate basement flooding and provide flood control benefits to the Des Plaines, Kankakee, and Illinois Rivers. It is estimated that such an underground system could provide 20 times the amount of protection offered by an improved conventional sewer system in Chicago.

This approach is dramatic and revolutionary. It calls for intercepting the existing network of sewers with vertical shafts, extending 600 or more feet underground. The shafts would lead to excavated galleries, which would flow into a tunnel leading away from the city. A pump-turbine plant at the tunnel outlet would use the stored water to generate electric power. Allowing for revenues from the sale of this power, the estimated cost of the new system would be about the same as the cost of expanding the present conventional drainage system, and the protection from pollution and floods would be far greater.

Mr. Chairman, we have for too many years paid inadequate attention to our priceless water. We are now paying the penalty for our neglect, reaping a whirlpool of pollution. To correct the corruption of our water supplies, we require research, experimentation, and demonstration. These few projects represent a worthy step in that direction.

I am hopeful that the treatment of the pollution problem contemplated by the Chicago feasibility study will provide great benefits to every metropolitan area plagued with inadequate drainage and sewage systems. I am gratified that our distinguished colleague from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] and the members of this committee have had the foresight to include extra funds for these demonstration grants.

I would also like to address myself briefly to another matter contained in this bill—the retention of operating funds during the next year for Public Health Service hospitals.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare proposed to close seven such hospitals over the next 4 years. One of the reasons given for this decision was a claim that it would save the Federal Government \$1 million. I did not analyze the cost-saving ratio for all seven institutions, but I did carefully study the alleged savings that would have been made by closing the U.S. Merchant Marine Hospital in Chicago. The figures showed that a shutdown would cost the Government more money than it would save.

The first two hospitals scheduled to be closed were in Chicago and Memphis. The committee discovered that the cost of caring for patients from these hospitals, in cross-servicing and contracting, would exceed the savings realized from closing them. The committee found that in 1966 alone the costs of caring for patients from the two hospitals would exceed the savings by \$212,000. Thus these closings would have produced a false and shortsighted economy.

Indeed, Mr. Chairman, the closing of the Marine Hospital would have multiplied those costs greatly. About 10 percent of the patients there would no longer be treated in a Federal hospital, and the costs of their treatment would probably have to be charged to the social security medical insurance fund, in the amount of \$164,000 a year. It would have taken another \$7,000 a year to care for the remaining 90 percent of the patients sent to other Federal hospitals. Thus the total annual operating cost would have been \$171,000.

The Public Health Service estimated it would save \$515,000 by investing in new Veterans' Administration construction instead of spending the \$1,200,000 it said was required to modernize the Marine Hospital. It would take but 3 years for the annual operating expense of \$171,000 to exceed the one-time savings in capital investment of \$515,000. Thereafter, the Government would have lost \$171,000 a year.

It is clear that the closing could not be justified on economic grounds. Nor could it be justified on the grounds of better service. This 138-bed hospital has served Great Lakes seamen, as well as active and retired service personnel and their dependents, for 92 years. Remove that hospital, Mr. Chairman, and you are left with only one other Merchant Marine hospital on the Great Lakes—at Detroit—and that hospital was scheduled to close, too. Take away the Memphis hospital, and merchant seamen would have no facilities on the entire Mississippi River north of New Orleans.

Early in our history President John Adams took special interest in the health care of merchant seamen and inaugurated this hospital system. Only 2 years ago President Kennedy said he wanted the Public Health Service to present a plan to provide more accessible care for seamen. What happened? The Public Health Service decided to close the few hospitals it had in this area, reducing accessibility to treatment instead of increasing it.

I am grateful that the committee closely scrutinized these operations, Mr. Chairman. It was important that unfounded claims of this economy be exposed. It is more important that satisfactory and accessible care remain available to seamen.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 7765 with special attention directed toward title II. It is felt there is little need to go into great detail justifying your support of the bill now before us as the committee and subcommittees have done a tremendous job in scrutinizing every detail.

I do, however, feel a need to express my deep and profound regret that a \$200,000 planning fund for a field laboratory for water pollution control was not included in the final bill submitted to this body. I am confident these funds were omitted in the interest of budgetary considerations and not due to a failure to recognize the pressing need for continued advancement in programs of this nature. The importance of water and the increasing dangers of its pollution, to public health and safety, is a matter of which we are all aware. The need for action has been established.

Obviously the seriousness of water pollution varies depending on the region in question. I believe there is a pressing need for an additional laboratory in the Missouri River Basin. This basin covers approximately 20 percent of the land mass of the country and serves the vastness of the midwestern agricultural areas and several tremendous metropolitan areas such as St. Louis, Kansas City, and Omaha. At present the closest field laboratory is located at Ann Arbor, Mich. Even the most bright-eyed optimists would not dare hope that the Midwest could be served by this laboratory alone due to the complexity of the Great Lakes pollution problems.

Therefore, how do we best serve the millions of people affected by Missouri River Basin pollution? It is imperative that we locate a laboratory in the basin and that we do it soon, while a solution is still within our grasp. Pollution in this basin should be the concern of every citizen who uses the products supplied by this area. And it concerns each person in the land, for you all know of midwestern agricultural and industrial production. I again express my regret on this matter and vow that I will continue to press for the needed planning funds until the laboratory is built and we are on our way to the consumption and use of clean and safe water.

I ask that all of you consider the gravity of the problem and join me in the attainment of necessary appropriations when we next take this problem under consideration.

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Chairman, I also wish to commend the chairman and the members of the Committee on Appropriations for wisely revising section 203 of this bill. As has already been stated, in the past an inflexible statutory limitation has been imposed on the amount of indirect costs which were permitted to be reimbursed by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, to institutions receiving research grants; in the future, however, assuming this revised section is adopted, the Bureau of the Budget instead will establish flexible administrative regulations authorizing amounts more closely approaching the true costs incurred by the institutions receiving grants. In so doing, the committee will relieve many universities and research institutes throughout the Nation from a troublesome financial burden.

In my own district alone, for example, the University of Michigan in recent years has suffered a deficit in recovery of indirect costs which has amounted

to over \$2 million each year. This amount, a significant element in the yearly overall budget of the university, has had to be withdrawn in part from funds otherwise available for student instruction.

If section 503 as proposed here is adopted, the deficit incurred should be far less, permitting more productive use of the funds available to the university.

I am further pleased to hear the chairman state that a similar provision will be included in the appropriations bills for all other pertinent agencies, so that the policy established here will prevail uniformly.

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of House bill 7765. As a new Member of Congress it was my good fortune to be accorded the privilege of serving on the Committee on Appropriations and also my good fortune to be selected to serve on the Subcommittee on Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare.

During the course of the hearings on this bill I was granted all the courtesies extended to senior members of the committee by that great gentleman from Rhode Island, the chairman of our committee, the Honorable JOHN FOGARTY.

Having had considerable experience in the administrative branch of Government, I concerned myself during the committee hearings and also outside of the committee chiefly with investigations of the administrative practices used by the various agencies represented before our committee.

This does not mean that I did not also concern myself with other details of the programs of the agencies included in this bill, for like all committee members I spent many hours weighing whether or not justifications warranted the appropriation requests that were being made. I would at this time, however, like to concern myself only with agency management practices.

In the expenditure of public funds, the first thing that each of us should be concerned with is that every dollar appropriated be used for the purposes indicated.

Our second concern should be that agency administrative procedures and internal procedures be conducted with the kind of efficiency that guarantees the best possible use of the dollar.

Prior to my coming to the Congress, and since I have been here, President Johnson has issued executive directives asking that agencies take cold, hard looks at their administrative procedures and that they eliminate those procedures and practices that contribute unnecessary effort to the administrative operation while devising new methods and systems that will guarantee maximum economical use of public funds.

The question then is: Has there been demonstrated an intent on the part of the administrative agencies to comply?

In the limited amount of time that has been available to me to talk to the heads of agencies, to ask questions at hearings, and to make on-the-job visits with employees performing all kinds of work, my general impression is that the attitude of the employees, of the heads

of departments, and of the Bureau of the Budget personnel is to see to it that we do attain maximum efficiency in the performance of governmental functions.

Followup procedures have been established that, in my opinion, stimulate any who might be reluctant to embrace positive action.

Mr. Chairman, there are two kinds of economy—false economy, and the real kind.

False economy more often than not is the product of executives who feel that the prestige of their positions depends on the number of file cabinets they can proudly display.

The enemies of false economy are methods and systems that, requiring a minimum expenditure of effort, result in maximum control in managing public funds.

True economy results when responsible people provide good management practices. Or, as I have said on another occasion, when they adopt the "work smarter, not harder" concept of fulfilling administrative function.

In the light of the great burdens presently placed upon Government administrators, true economy in 1965 necessitates the use of automatic data-processing equipment. But equipment alone is not enough. Good procedures demand that before we can use profitably this kind of equipment, it is necessary to devise efficient administrative procedure for its operation.

In a word, we must "systemate" before we can automate.

The application of such equipment to governmental processes has long concerned me. I am convinced that the contribution this mechanized equipment can make to the handling of many of the clerical governmental procedures can result in a great saving of public funds.

An example of this may be seen in the social security department. Had not such equipment been used in the last several years, the status quo cost of operations of this department alone would have been some \$80 million more than it is today.

The fact is that without the use of computers it would have been almost physically impossible to process the claims of those senior citizens who have already retired.

Consider, then, the condition when the extra burden results that will be placed on this department as a result of the passage of medicare. We could go on and on citing more and more examples.

The opportunity that has been accorded me as a result of the privilege of serving on this committee has made me increasingly aware of the powerful contribution which computers have made to the progress of medical research.

Today they are becoming an integral part of the research laboratory. Beyond the laboratory, in the operating rooms of our leading research hospitals, surgeons are planning to use computers to measure and record continuous changes in the body before, during, and after surgery.

Vast amounts of data have been captured by automatic instruments, and the analysis of the data should provide an

unusually rich opportunity for physicians, mathematicians, and engineers, working together, to identify some of the basic patterns of disturbance in normal function in heart disease, cancer, and other serious illnesses.

A large portion of the financial support necessary to establish computers in medical research laboratories and hospitals has come from the Federal Government, through the National Institutes of Health. Moreover, the NIH has pioneered the use of computers in its own laboratories and in the operating rooms of the Clinical Center.

There, for example, patients in critical need of heart surgery receive the most advanced medical care while, at the same time, they provide through the computer and other automatic instruments vital data which can help to save countless other hearts in the years ahead.

The modern-day computer in medical research is much more than a set of boxes with complicated wiring such as we are accustomed to see in business offices today. The human or animal heart in action does not produce a set of numbers. Its movement must first be sensed as a change in blood pressure within the heart or along the blood vessels. These pressure changes must be converted to continuous electrical signals which can be captured by tape-recording equipment. The information must then be displayed visually on a television screen to provide immediate vital intelligence to the surgeon on the condition of his patient, or to the researcher on the progress of his experiment.

An impressive array of equipment is required to perform these tasks, particularly if many variables are to be studied at the same time. To carry out mathematical analysis of the data requires still more electronic equipment to select those portions of the continuous record which require further study, and to convert the electrical signals to numbers. Only then can one begin to use the vast power of the digital computer with which most of us have become familiar.

To bring the full power of this computer complex to the service of medical research and patient care requires two essential commodities: first, large amounts of money for expensive equipment; second, and much more difficult to come by, topnotch mathematical and engineering talent. Imaginative mathematicians with a strong interest in biology are needed to translate medical and biological problems into mathematical models, without which comprehensive analysis and interpretation of large amounts of data cannot proceed. Highly creative computer and instrument engineers are fully as necessary in the biomedical research laboratory and in the modern research hospital as they are in the design and control of our space rockets.

Recognizing the need to provide these resources for its research scientists and administrators, the National Institutes of Health have established a new Division of Computer Research and Technology, whose mathematicians and computer experts will work side by side

with NIH's medical scientists in laboratory and hospital.

The Division will undertake professional research in the relevant aspects of advanced mathematics and computer theory. In addition, it will operate a large-scale central computer to which scientists throughout the NIH campus could even be connected by data transmission stations in their own laboratories and offices, if such should prove to be desirable.

These computer resources will be available not only to the research scientist and hospital clinicians at NIH, but to the administrative and management staff as well. The new Division will assist grants administrators in the development of an integrated computer system for processing grants information. This will permit a more continuous evaluation of the progress of grant supported research. It will provide immediate information on the geographic distribution of grants, on the relative concentration by area of study, by size of university or college, and by other factors important to scientists and administrators participating in the allocation of grant funds.

Equally important will be the savings in time and money to the overall management of NIH activities. The resources of the new division will enable NIH central management to set up a computer-oriented system of regular information reports needed for decision.

Even more vital to effective and economical management, these resources will permit the immediate retrieval of detailed data by direct hookup to files stored in the central computer. For the first time, NIH management will be able to assemble rapidly, with a minimum of clerical personnel, the information needed to answer special requests and to carry out special studies on which management decisions may be based.

I am frankly excited over the stimulating opportunities which this new division of Computer Research and Technology offers to the NIH scientific research community, to the medical care capabilities of the Clinical Center, and to the management of programs entrusted to NIH administrators.

This is a dynamic new activity whose benefits to medical research—and to all of us whose lives are enriched by the results of such research—can far exceed the money spent to support it. More funds are needed to implement the work of this new division than are provided in the current budget request for fiscal year 1966. Even more important, no arbitrary grade restrictions should be permitted to undermine the ability of this Division to attract the first-rate mathematicians and computer experts needed to do the job.

I suppose there are some who might say this device offers just another method to get more funds. Those who think so forget that often it is necessary to spend in order to provide the method or procedure best fitted to guarantee maximum economy and efficiency.

To illustrate, let me give you an example. In a National Institute of Health project, a researcher in carrying

on an experiment for many years has been burdened with the laborious task of having to spend the large share of his time recording data gained from his experiment.

It has been necessary that he compute it, analyze it, compare it with previous data and perform many other similar functions, thereby limiting himself to a very few hours to be spent in pure research alone.

At NIH many scientists now can look forward to spending the big share of their valuable time in basic research experiments because they have been able to collaborate with mathematicians and engineers in an application of the physical sciences to the biomedical sciences. Mechanized equipment that has been made available—and that will be made available in the future as a result of these appropriations—has the job of recording permanently, of analyzing, of computing, of comparing, and of giving the result to persons engaged in pure research on a full-time basis.

Yes, today's research scientist and tomorrow's can look forward to many, many extra hours made available through such means. I am as sure as are all of the rest of my colleagues here that the result of this extra time made available to these humanitarians will be to cause the progress in the future in the medical and life sciences to be fantastic by any standards we now know.

This, then, is an expenditure that will provide better procedural practices while saving many man-hours of research talent.

But, above and beyond that, it is logical to predict that it will provide a day, a month, or maybe many years of extra life to human beings. I am sure none of my colleagues would value this in terms of dollars.

I wish at this time, Mr. Chairman, to commend the National Institutes of Health for the leadership they have shown in this field. I trust the Congress will continue its generous support of these efforts.

And once again I wish to thank the chairman of our committee, and the individual members, for the patience they have shown me as a new Member of this Congress and for the opportunities for service they have afforded me in my few months here.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, on April 27, 1965, I spent a few hours at St. Elizabeths Hospital, the only mental hospital operated by the Federal Government that admits all types of mental patients. Among the 7,500 patients to whom the hospital affords service are children as young as 10 years of age and oldsters up to 100. They are Negro and white, with a sprinkling of other races. They suffer from all known forms of mental illness, and not a few have other handicaps, as well. Some are blind, deaf, or physically crippled. They are veterans, residents of the District of Columbia, the Virgin Islands, and American citizens who became ill while out of the country. Some are well off financially, and pay for their treatment, but most are afflicted by poverty. They have come as voluntary patients, by civil com-

mitment, and some 750 as a result of criminal proceedings. Some have been in the hospital only a few days, while others have been there for 20 years or more. Some are treated only on their wards, but the majority are able to move about the 360-acre campus to various activities throughout the hospital. Many work a major part of the day in such places as the wards, laundry, warehouse, kitchens, and on the grounds. Some work in the city and sleep at the hospital, participating in treatment programs in the evening. Others live at home and return for treatment during the day. Some return every day, others only once every month or two. Treatment ranges from the administration of medications to individual and group psychotherapy, occupational and recreational therapy, and vocational training.

My visit was at once one of the most hopeful and rewarding, yet disheartening and annoying experiences I have had in recent years. The hopeful and rewarding aspects had to do with seeing some of the newer buildings and equipment provided in the last few years, and meeting with the able and dedicated staff members who treat patients in these and the older facilities. St. Elizabeths has, as far as I can tell as a layman, some of the finest resources available for the treatment of multiple-handicapped, mentally ill persons.

It has an extensive training program in psychiatry and some other medical specialties, psychology, undergraduate and graduate nursing, occupational therapy, ministry to the mentally ill, social work, and psychodrama. This training program could be expanded, with proper financial support, to increase its contribution to the critically short national pool of mental health personnel. Its efforts to develop new teaching methods for the training of these needed personnel could be further developed.

The hospital is also carrying out critically needed research, much of it in collaboration with the National Institute of Mental Health. With the research resources of the Institute and the patient resources of St. Elizabeths, both located in the Washington metropolitan area, we have the opportunity to strengthen greatly the training and research endeavors of the national mental health program. We also have an opportunity and an obligation to demonstrate, through joint endeavors of the hospital, the Institute, and the city of Washington, how services to the mentally ill can be provided in the most effective way possible, and how the size of large public mental hospitals can be materially reduced.

This brings me to the disheartening and annoying aspects of my visit. St. Elizabeths was established in 1855, and is still forced to use many buildings from 60 to 110 years old, that have long since been outmoded.

Many of these older buildings are frightfully overcrowded. Despite the best efforts of the staff, these buildings scream out of society's callous disregard for the dignity of our fellow human beings who are housed and treated in them. Those buildings must go. They must be

replaced. To make matters worse, the Congress has already appropriated funds for the construction of one badly needed replacement building, and the working drawings and specifications were completed last June, almost a year ago. But the contract for construction has been delayed, apparently at the request of the District Government. Why this has occurred, I do not fully know, but I mean to find out.

This most affluent of all nations in the world, deeply engrossed as it is in the rights of its own citizens and the freedom of all men, simply cannot and must not continue to treat the mentally ill as second-class citizens. The Congress has launched a broad program to assist the States, local communities, universities, and other teaching and research institutions to improve the mental health of our people. Yet, the only federally operated general mental hospital, St. Elizabeths—located, here, in the Nation's Capital—does not have the physical and staff resources necessary to carry out the assignment we have given it.

In a sense, St. Elizabeths now epitomizes the problem faced by most public mental hospitals in this country. It has some fine buildings and equipment, and a knowledgeable and dedicated staff. It is doing an excellent job within the resources available to it. Well over half of all patients now admitted are returned to the community within a few months of their admission. But it also has some obsolete, rundown, and wholly unacceptable facilities. Its staff is too small to give each patient his best possible chance for improvement.

I address the conscience of every Member of this Congress. We can ill afford to continue to neglect the patients in our own Federal mental hospital, while urging the States and localities to improve their services to the mentally ill. Let us demonstrate that the patients at St. Elizabeths are not second-class citizens, and develop our own resources as a model for the Nation.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Chairman, for a number of years now there has been much tongue-clucking and quite a few thousand words written about the young people of this Nation who because of their lack of education, or their environment, or their attitude, have been lumped into the disadvantaged category.

In the past year a number of programs have been launched by the Federal Government whose laudable aim has been to bring help, and aid and counsel to these young people who, though no fault of their own, are considered to be economic and social pariahs.

I believe that most of these programs are succeeding. But one of them, with which I am well acquainted because it operates within my own district, is threatened with extinction almost before it has drawn its first breath.

I refer to the youth opportunity center program which was launched early this year by the Department of Labor's Bureau of Employment Security. These centers are not just job referral agencies. Nor are they of the mission variety which offer a bowl of soup, a bed for the night, and a heartfelt prayer.

These youth opportunity centers are proving to be economic and social havens for the nearly one million young people between 16 and 21 who nobody will hire because they have no education, no skills, and not much hope. The Department of Labor planned to have 105 of these centers in operation by June 30, and 139 early in fiscal 1966. But those plans may have gone aglimmering because the House Committee on Appropriations recently turned down a request by the Department of Labor that general funds from the Treasury be used to supplement certain trust funds. The committee explained its reasons for rejecting the Department's request, and it also noted that it was aware that its action "is going to mean severe curtailment of some activities of that Department."

However, I do not believe that the members of that committee were aware that its action could curtail the hopes of thousands of young Americans who might find the counsel and encouragement they need through the system of youth opportunity centers that are now in operation throughout our country. These centers are making a valuable contribution to solving the problems of disadvantaged youth. To close them now, to halt their development, seemingly would indicate that we are content to pay only lip service to the needs of our youth, but not to offer them the skilled counsel they must have if the are to achieve a productive role in our society.

It is my sincere hope that this mistake can be corrected and that the youth opportunity centers will continue to perform their important function.

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Chairman, although total employment and national output rose to a recordbreaking high in 1964, the number of unemployed teenagers actually increased. Youth unemployment is a serious and growing problem. One out of every nine young people between the ages of 16 and 22 who are out of school and in the labor force today is jobless. The problem is serious and can be expected to become even more so, for growing numbers of untrained and inexperienced youth will be competing for jobs in the face of a steadily shrinking demand for unskilled workers both in industry and on the farm.

Among young members of disadvantaged minority group some of our most serious problems of chronic unemployment are to be found. The rate of unemployment among nonwhite is about twice as high as that of white youth. Even nonwhite youths who have high school diplomas find difficulty in getting jobs. Their unemployment rate is double that of their white counterparts.

Seeing little to inspire hope and ambition, some children of the slums may turn to unlawful acts. Delinquency rates are about three times higher in urban than in rural areas, and within the cities delinquency tends to be concentrated in slum sections.

Because many of the unemployed youth have deep-seated problems, because many may be alienated, hard to reach, and disillusioned because they have in the past been too frequently promised help and too frequently failed

by those who purport to help them, the services of the youth opportunity centers have been planned to provide services to meet the needs of individuals. The procedures of the centers will emphasize continuity of service to youth. To the maximum extent possible, each youth will be assigned to a counselor who will work with him from the time he first has contact with the center, through training and remedial services, according to his needs, to satisfactory employment. Counseling will be focused on the goal of ultimate employment through a vocational plan. Each youth will be helped according to his needs and the help will not be terminated until it is no longer needed. Emphasis will be on development of the employability of each youth to the maximum of his potential, to furnish employers with useful, trained, capable employees.

A youth opportunity center has been approved for Newark, N.J., and is scheduled to open shortly. However, the future of these centers may be in doubt because of a recent action by the House Appropriations Committee. I am sure that the members of this committee did not intend that their vote to reject additional appropriations to the Department of Labor might seriously cripple the youth opportunity program. It is my deep conviction that this House and the Senate should act quickly to assure the continuation of these centers which are serving so well the disadvantaged youth of our Nation.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman, the new youth opportunity centers now being opened all over the country are quickly capturing public support, thus providing the need for this expanded service to youth. Emphasis is placed on youth employability at the centers, for many of today's youth are virtually unemployable. This is caused by a combination of circumstances. Employers must demand more highly qualified employees, automation and technological advances have made immense changes in the structure of the labor force, all but eliminating the need for unskilled workers, and added to this situation is the vastly increased youth population. Thus, when youth are undereducated or disadvantaged in other ways, as many are in this country today, their employment problems are usually acute.

The centers' community relations coordinators work actively with all agencies in the community, whether governmental, private, or voluntary, and enlist their cooperation. This support is essential, because it has become apparent that many youths are in need of extra services which obviously could not be offered in the centers, but which can be made available to them through effective local liaison arrangements. These needs may arise from educational deficiency, health, legal, psychiatric, rehabilitative, and other problems.

At the national level, the USES staff works with national officers of various organizations, and they in turn endorse the YOC program and recommend cooperation of State and local affiliates. In addition to assistance in providing needed youth services, these organiza-

tions have proved effective in working with the hard-to-reach youth. Most of our severely disadvantaged youth are frustrated and discouraged. They need motivation and encouragement to even seek help for themselves. A number of voluntary organizations have been actively concerned with youth employment programs in the last few years, and many local programs have tackled related areas, such as school dropouts. Now the youth opportunity centers are providing the focal point for these efforts.

Another YOC medium that is actively involving the community is the YOC advisory committee, whose members work individually and as a group in furthering the mission of the center. These committees include representatives of all elements in the community, including the disadvantaged themselves.

It is my firm conviction that these youth opportunity centers, providing they receive full congressional support, have the opportunity to become the prime coordinating factor in this Nation's efforts to end the economic frustrations of its young citizens. They should, in my opinion, receive our wholehearted endorsement and support.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Chairman, last week, the House Committee on Appropriations dealt what could be a serious blow to an important program that has been designed to render real and effective help to the more than a million young people of this Nation who find themselves at the very bottom of our economic totem pole.

The committee acted, I believe, reluctantly and took considerable pains to give its reasons for rejecting a request for an additional appropriation by the Department of Labor. I do not rise to dispute the committee's decision, nor its recommendation. I do rise to protest its effect.

By refusing the Department's request for an appropriation of \$39,280,000 from general funds of the Treasury, the committee in its own words stated that "it is going to mean severe curtailment of activities that the department feels quite important."

One of these activities is the operation of the youth opportunity centers, the first of which was established earlier this year. These centers' financial base rests on the funds which the Department requested and which the committee refused.

None of these youth opportunity centers has been established in my district, so perhaps I can speak of their value with a certain objectivity. One hundred and five of them were scheduled to be in operation by June 30 of this year. Their primary purpose is to provide counsel for the disadvantaged young people who are between 16 and 21.

The problems that young people of this age and of this economic and social classification encounter are without number. They need the advice and counsel from persons who understand them emotionally and intellectually. They need to find such persons in an environment which holds its institutional atmosphere to a minimum. This

has been, and is, the purpose of the youth opportunity centers which operate under the guidance of the Department of Labor's Bureau of Economic Security.

These youth opportunity centers have just begun their vital work of bringing help and hope to our young economic cripples. These centers have been launched with a minimum of fanfare. Indeed, their reputation has been spread by word of mouth among the young whom they have already served. I hate to think what will happen if our youth opportunity centers are forced to hang up an "out of business" sign on their doors.

I believe that these centers are a vital segment of our efforts to relieve the poverty among our young citizens. They should not be abandoned. We must find the means to preserve them.

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Chairman, the U.S. Employment Service has been actively concerned with youth since its inception in 1918. In the past few years, however, the Employment Service has attempted to reappraise its services to youth in an effort to see what changes could perhaps be innovated to best meet the employment needs of youth today. In the process of this examination, it was decided that although much was being done for youth in the existing 1,900 local employment offices across the Nation, it was not enough. The outcome was the recommendation for establishing a network of youth opportunity centers with at least one center in every State.

These centers are to be an integral part of the USES system, but will be housed in separate facilities and only provide services to youth ages 16 to 22. They will serve as a focal point for all Government and community efforts to aid youth. The Job Corps and the Neighborhood Youth Corps will rely heavily on these centers to do the initial recruiting and screening of applicants for their respective programs as well as to provide supportive services for their projects once they are operational. In those communities having a community action program, the YOC will serve as an important resource for youth referral in their communitywide program.

As of May 1, 1965, some 29 separate centers opened their doors and became operational. Hopefully before the end of the 1965 fiscal year, there will be approximately 139 centers open in some 105 different major metropolitan areas of our country. From those reports which have been received, the general response to the few operating centers thus far has been more than just enthusiastic.

Unfortunately, these centers will not be enough. There are many other urban areas not provided with these highly specialized services to youth. Rural areas are also neglected by this present distribution of centers. In one case in a New England State, a youth traveled 50 miles on foot from a rural area to the nearest center for help. In the Appalachian area, a number of rural youth have traveled 30 miles or more to reach a center. Those centers which are proposed for this first year of operation are all in the more heavily populated sections of the States which gives little hope for the



rural youth to benefit from the services of a designated place where he may receive personalized service relating to employment.

These centers are a vital, important segment of our attempt to relieve the economic frustration of our jobless youth. It is my earnest hope and firm belief that they should be encouraged and expanded.

The solution to the dilemma was offered by the Appropriations Committee itself, of which I am a member. When it stated its refusal to approve the Department's request for the additional appropriation, it noted that this "is going to mean a severe curtailment of some activities that the Department of Labor feels are quite important, if legislation is not enacted to increase the limitation."

It is my conviction, Mr. Chairman, that legislation to raise the limitation on trust funds that are available for grants to States for unemployment compensation and employment service administration should be speedily introduced and quickly voted into law. Otherwise, a most worthwhile program of needed help for our disadvantaged young people is bound to suffer.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have permission to extend their own remarks at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. Sixty-four Members are present, not a quorum.

The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 89]

Ashley	Halleck	Mailliard
Ayres	Hanna	Mathias
Bandstra	Hansen, Wash.	Mills
Blatnik	Hardy	Morrison
Brademas	Hays	Powell
Broyhill, Va.	Hollifield	Redlin
Cahill	Holland	Resnick
Clevenger	Hosmer	Senner
Conyers	Huot	Smith, Iowa
Curtis	Irwin	Stephens
Dickinson	Jones, Mo.	Taylor
Diggs	Krebs	Teague, Tex.
Ford	Latta	Thomson, Wis.
Gerald R.	Leggett	Toll
Gialmo	McDowell	Whitten
Goodell	MacGregor	Wilson, Bob
Hagen, Calif.	Mackie	Young

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H.R. 7765, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 383 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The Committee will rise informally to receive a message.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will receive a message from the President of the United States.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries.

LABOR-HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE APPROPRIATIONS, 1966

The SPEAKER. The Committee will resume its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] is recognized.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, the HEW and Labor appropriations bill for fiscal 1966 is a bill which I support. I am not going to brag about the bill because I am not particularly proud of all of it. But I defend and support this bill because I am a realist, and under the circumstances, it is not a bad bill. As the gentleman from Rhode Island has indicated in his remarks earlier today, our committee worked long and hard on this bill and conducted hearings over a period of several months. In marking up this bill, being a member of the minority party, understanding fully the organization of this House with its two to one Democratic majority, I worked with the members of this committee to arrive at the best bill that could be presented on the floor of the House today.

We have heard some talk about the cost of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and how costs have been on the rise each of the past few years. I have served on this committee for some 13 years. I remember when we considered the first bill from this Department. It was a little more than a billion dollars.

The bill before the House today covers about \$8 billion in general revenues and some \$24 billion in trust funds. It is the second largest appropriation bill which will be considered by this Congress.

I should like to remind my friends in the House today that within the next 6 weeks we will add to this bill, in supplemental appropriations, more than \$3 billion. We will add that \$3 billion because of action which has been taken on the floor of the House in new authorizations, for new programs. I refer to the medicare bill. There are vast amounts authorized from general funds, as well as trust funds. The total trust fund and general fund amount authorized in that bill will be \$7 billion in the first full fiscal year of operation.

In addition to that extra burden, so far as the trust funds and the general fund of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare appropriation in fiscal year 1966 are concerned, we have also added, by a vote of this House, a new authorization in the area of education, of more than a billion dollars.

Today, after this bill is acted upon, we will pass two bills which will add to the expenditures in fiscal year 1966

many millions more. There will not be a single vote against those bills, which have been reported unanimously from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, when the roll is called a little later this afternoon.

This bill will be bigger than the Department of Defense appropriation bill, if this trend continues, by the year 1970.

This bill as it stands today carries \$7,964 million in appropriations, over \$1 billion more than the bill we brought to you a year ago, but it is \$329 million less than the President requested in his budget. Furthermore, the party of the Great—and very expensive—Society has a majority of 2 to 1 on our subcommittee and on the full Committee on Appropriations. There are some features and some dollar amounts, that had we had the votes, we would have altered. But realism dictates that when you are weak, you negotiate. So, under the circumstances, this is a good bill.

As the gentleman from Rhode Island, the chairman of our subcommittee, has pointed out, this bill is a result of compromise. Under the circumstances I have just outlined I feel that we on the minority side should be reasonably satisfied with the results.

Another factor that one must consider in making a realistic appraisal of this bill is the fact that the last Congress passed a very considerable amount of new legislation that is requiring increasingly large sums of money to carry out. In most cases this new legislation passed the Congress by very large majorities. I am sure if it were coming up now in this Congress this legislation would pass by even larger majorities. The majority of Congress has expressed its will in no uncertain terms so it would be completely unrealistic to attempt to withhold the funds.

I will give you a few specific examples. Last year's bill included \$183 million for the vocational education program; this year's bill, under the expanded authorization, carries \$262 million. Last year's bill carried \$463 million for higher education facilities construction; this year it is \$641 million. Last year's bill for defense educational activities carried \$287 million; under the expanded authorization it is \$412 million in this year's bill. There are several others.

If it were not for the increases in the bill to carry out the further expansion of these programs that was authorized by the last Congress, this bill would actually be just about the same size as the bill we brought you last year.

Now no one should be misled into thinking that this is the full bill for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies for the fiscal year 1966. This is just part 1. Part 2 of the Labor HEW bill is going to be coming before this House likely during the last half of June. Part 2 will include some more extremely expensive Great Society programs under legislation being enacted by the current Congress.

Programs that will likely be carried in part 2 of the Labor-HEW bill will be the poverty program for which the administration is requesting authorization for

\$1½ billion. It will undoubtedly include funds for the recently enacted Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965—we already have a budget request of \$1,345 million for that program. Of course no one knows at this point how much may be requested to carry out the recommendations of the President's Commission on Heart Disease, Cancer, and Stroke, but we already have a request for \$44 million and the administration has requested additional legislation, the cost of which not even the administration knows. It will undoubtedly include funds for the expanded Manpower Development and Training Act that passed last month. It will undoubtedly include funds for the medicare program, if the Senate passes this before part 2 is considered. And there are many others that are well within the realm of probability for inclusion. There is the arts and humanities bill, water pollution control amendments, the health research facilities bill, the new air pollution bill, the Community Health Services Extension Amendments of 1965, a new Community Mental Health Centers Act, a new juvenile delinquency program, and there are several more.

Mr. Chairman, it looks like the budget requests for part 2 will total about \$5 billion. So, just in funds appropriated out of the general funds of the Treasury, the Labor-HEW bill—including both part 1 and part 2—may well be over \$13 billion for the next fiscal year. The amazing growth of these programs, as measured by their cost is illustrated by comparing this figure with the total of the Department of Labor and Health, Education and Welfare, and Related Agencies Appropriation Act for fiscal year 1956. That act totaled exactly \$2,373,516,500. In just 10 years the cost of these activities has increased over 5 times.

Mr. Chairman, even this does not tell the whole story. In addition to the funds that we are appropriating out of general funds of the Treasury for these two departments and related agencies, the American public is called upon to finance several trust funds to carry out such programs as old-age and survivors insurance, unemployment compensation, railroad retirement, and so forth. The taxes paid to support these activities are just as real as the taxes paid into general funds of the Treasury. It is estimated that these trust funds will cost the taxpayers \$24,385 million in fiscal year 1966. If we accept the logical conclusion that funds out of the Treasury will total \$13 billion for 1966, we arrive at a total of over \$37 billion for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies.

Mr. Chairman, this is already the largest appropriation bill that comes before this House with the single exception of the defense appropriation bill, and I predict that within the next 10 years it will be the largest "period."

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Rhode Island has done his usual good job of explaining the important details concerning appropriations recommended in the bill and I shall not take the time of the Committee to cover the same ground again, but I would like to take 2 or 3 min-

utes to speak about one of the general provisions of the bill.

For several years this bill has carried a general provision that restricted to a certain percentage the amount of money that could be paid to a research grantee for indirect costs of his research project. This built up from the early years of the National Institutes of Health. At first they allowed nothing for indirect costs. Then this policy was changed and for some years they allowed 8 percent of the direct costs as an allowance for part of the indirect costs. Then the NIH increased this allowance to 15 percent. When they proposed to further liberalize the allowance for indirect costs, Congress placed a limitation of 15 percent in the appropriation bill. In the 1963 bill, this was increased to 20 percent, which has been the percentage since.

There is no doubt that these research grants are of benefit to the schools and other institutions receiving them. For this reason, and to further assure that these funds will be efficiently and economically used, the committee is including in this bill a requirement for financial participation on the part of grantees. It has become increasingly evident to the committee, however, that tying financial participation to indirect costs results in considerable inequity. For some projects, especially those involving a considerable amount of equipment purchases, indirect costs may actually be below 20 percent of the direct costs and thus, under the old provision, the grantee would receive 100 percent of all costs. Other projects have indirect costs running as high as 50 percent and, thus, the grantee is bearing a substantial percentage of total costs.

Another factor was brought out in the recent study of the National Institutes of Health conducted by the Wooldridge committee. Its report stated:

We believe that steps should be taken to make it easier for all involved—scientists, administrators, and Government representatives—to obtain a clear picture of all the costs legitimately associated with each NIH-supported project. Reliance upon an arbitrary indirect cost percentage should be abandoned. Instead, each institution should be encouraged to present a complete accounting of all the costs of "doing business" that it can support as chargeable or allocable to the project in question, with a minimum of emphasis on formal direct/indirect distinctions.

Section 203 of the bill follows this principle. It simply will require that each grantee must bear a portion of the total cost of the project. In order that this provision may be administered in the most equitable way, the committee has not laid down any arbitrary formula, but will expect that the Bureau of the Budget make a very detailed and thorough study to determine how best to calculate this division of costs. It may well be that this will have to be a variable formula in order to be equitable for different types of projects and different types of institutions.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Rhode Island in his remarks said he would have liked to have added \$100 million for the National Institutes of Health in fiscal year 1966. He proposed that in

our subcommittee. I proposed that we support President Johnson on his figure for this particular item in the budget. As a great supporter of the President, I add that this figure was not agreed to in our particular committee. But we compromised between President Johnson's figure and the figure advocated by the gentleman from Rhode Island, and there is \$11.7 million in this bill for the National Institutes of Health. That is almost entirely in the area of heart, kidney, and drug research, and the undergraduate program so far as the National Cancer Institute is concerned. These are very strategic areas. I support the action of the committee in encouraging these programs; particularly in the area of the artificial heart, in the area of the new drug research, and also in the area of the new kidney dialysis program.

Mr. Chairman, the appropriations for the National Institutes of Health include no general, across-the-board increases.

Ample evidence was presented to the committee that every one of the Institutes is faced with important problems demanding research for which funds are not available. The catalog of diseases and human afflictions is long. The national resources devoted to medical research have been dramatically expanded during the past 10 years but the trained men, the laboratories, the clinical research facilities, and the funds available are still far from enough to cover the entire frontier along which man is waging his age-old battle against disease.

For example, I have just obtained a tabulation from the National Institutes of Health which shows that their current appropriations fall more than \$40 million short of the sum that would be needed to make awards to all the grant applicants whose projects have been reviewed and found worthy of support—not only for their scientific merit but for their direct relevance to the health research mission of the National Institutes of Health.

The 1966 budget estimates make no allowance for these unfunded projects nor do they make any allowance for a similar number of highly worthwhile projects for which support will almost certainly have to be refused next year.

Despite these demonstrated general needs of the NIH programs, the committee has taken a very conservative approach in its action on the NIH budget. The appropriations contained in the bill will make a very substantial contribution to but will not fully meet the total legitimate needs of medical research and research training in this country.

The committee has, in fact, confined itself to providing for the NIH a few selected increases for programs which are so important and which hold out so great a promise of benefit for the people of this country that any delay in getting them underway would be indefensible.

An example of one such area is the work that needs to be done to develop an artificial heart. Heart failure of one kind or another is now the leading killer in this country. Many of its victims could be saved and restored to useful life if some longer term assistance than is now available could be given to the heart

while it recuperates. The present heart-lung machines have made possible the modern miracles of heart surgery but they can only take the place of a normal heart for a matter of hours—long enough to give time for an operation but not nearly long enough to sustain life for more protracted periods of therapy or to give nature time to repair heart damage.

Thousands of lives will be saved when a device is developed which can take over the duties of the heart not for a matter of hours but for days or for weeks. Scientists are agreed that such a device is well within the realm of possibility but many unresolved problems stand in the way and a major developmental program is needed to bring it into being.

This country has not hesitated to pour hundreds of millions of dollars into the developmental research needed to put a man into orbit. I see no reason why so important a project as the development of an artificial heart should not be approached with the same vigor and determination. Despite the great complexities of the problem, the amount of money needed will be considerably less and the benefits to the individual citizen—and, I suspect, to the Nation—will be very much greater.

The development of an artificial heart which can be implanted in the body to take the place of a natural heart whose function can not be restored is the ultimate goal but presents much greater difficulties. The achievement of this goal will necessarily lie much further in the future. But its achievement can be speeded up by decades if we make it possible for scientists to tackle that problem with the same determination with which they have so successfully tackled equally difficult problems in nuclear and space research.

The possibility of developing a replacement for the heart has been regarded as a feasible research objective for more than 7 years. Little support has been available during this period for research in this field but individual investigators have worked on it as best they could and have at least demonstrated the project's feasibility. About 20 experimental blood pumps have already been tested on animals with varying degrees of success.

Mr. Chairman, success in so complex a venture requires a sustained and coordinated attack. Plans for such an attack have been drawn up by the National Heart Institute with the advice of a distinguished group of specialists. These plans include the establishment of multidisciplinary research groups which will devote themselves to an intensive study of the problems in this area. These groups will draw heavily on our national engineering capability and will need to make contractual arrangements with industrial firms having competence and experience in such fields as miniaturization, plastics, and electronics to develop or produce experimental devices to explore new approaches to the problem.

The increase of \$2.5 million in the appropriation for the National Heart Institute will make it possible to get this work underway.

The development of an artificial kidney presents a similar opportunity for a

lifesaving advance against a group of diseases that each year claim thousands of lives.

The artificial kidney device now available is a complex laboratory model. Very few exist and their duplication is limited by the scarcity of the highly trained technical personnel needed to operate them. The process is very expensive—it costs about \$10,000 a year for a single patient—and the patient must go to the hospital at frequent intervals to have his blood purified by this artificial kidney.

The feasibility of an external device that will do the work of the kidneys has, however, been clearly demonstrated. What is needed now is a major effort to solve the problems standing in the way of the development of a machine that will be easier to operate and that can be made available to the victims of kidney failure at a more reasonable cost.

Not all illness involving kidney failure can be successfully treated by the use of an artificial kidney. It has, however, been estimated that, if artificial kidneys were generally available today, several thousand new cases could be treated each year. In a few years the number of people whose lives will be sustained by these devices, would number in the tens of thousands.

The increase of \$2 million included in the bill for the National Institute of Arthritis and Metabolic Diseases for this project is a very small investment when measured in terms of the number of lives it may save.

I shall single out only one more example of the special purposes served by the increases recommended by the committee.

This is the increase of \$1,250,000 for the Division of Computer Research and Technology at NIH. This is a new Division which is being set up to exploit the tremendous capabilities of computers both for biomedical research and for the treatment of patients.

Computers are already being used for a variety of purposes in the treatment of patients—such as, for example, in the more accurate determination and control of exposure to radiation for cancer patients. Computers are also extensively used in drug-screening programs and some progress has been made in using computers to select the most effective drug for a given patient.

The full range of the application of computers to medical problems, however, remains to be explored. The division will work on such projects as the application of computers to the rapid interpretation of X-ray photographs and electrocardiograms, the automatic analysis of laboratory specimens, the testing of blood samples, the retrieval and correlation of laboratory data, and the building of mathematical models of biological processes which will make possible closely controlled studies that cannot be carried out by ordinary laboratory or clinical procedures.

The application of computer technology to biomedical problems is in its infancy. Many of the basic problems of transplanting biological information into computer language remain to be solved—one of the most difficult communication problems in the life sciences is the communication between man and machine.

The new Division will undertake intensive work in this area. It will also provide training not only for young scientists who want to make a career in the promising new field of biomathematics but for other scientists in order to help them to take advantage of computers as a powerful tool for their on-going research.

The committee is particularly impressed by the opportunities for new approaches to health research problems that will result from the harnessing of computer capabilities to the more traditional biomedical research procedures. It should like to see this field developed as rapidly as possible so that its potential benefits to the improvement of the diagnosis and treatment of disease will not be unnecessarily delayed.

I am convinced that the increases for the National Institutes of Health recommended by the committee are a sound and wise expenditure of public funds. I cannot think of a more worthwhile contribution that the Federal Government can make to the national welfare than the continuing and energetic support of work that so directly affects the well-being of every citizen.

In the area of hospital construction last year we increased the authorizations under the Hill-Burton Act. The bill we bring before you today is \$100 million below the authorizations. It is below the President's figure by about \$40 million because of the formula which was involved in marking up this particular bill.

I do not believe for a minute that the other body will not add some authorizations, but to me authorizations are not sacred cows. It is my hope that we can keep this spending level somewhere in line, because there are many other hospital construction programs which are in being at the present time, such as under the Appalachia program. In January we will have the Great Lakes program. We will now go forward with a new accelerated public works program and a depressed areas aid program, all in the area of hospital construction.

So I think the recommendation of this committee is just and fair in this area.

Mr. Chairman, there is one other area that I would like to discuss. It concerns an amendment enacted in the 2d session of the 88th Congress and deals with the vocational rehabilitation portion of the HEW appropriation bill.

During the course of the 88th Congress, certain facts had come to my attention which, on examination, compelled me to offer an amendment to Public Law 565 to make possible the use of funds of private nonprofit agencies to serve as the State's share in the matching of Federal money for construction of rehabilitation facilities and workshops. This amendment was accepted by the committee and by the Congress and came to be known as the Laird amendment.

For a few brief moments, Mr. Chairman, I would like to discuss, for the record, the background of the Laird amendment.

In 1954 Public Law 565 was hailed in Wisconsin and other States as a historic milestone in rehabilitation history. Little was it dreamed at the time that within a few years this monumental legislation would pose a threat to the very

functioning of the State of Wisconsin Rehabilitation Division because of a legal technicality. In 1961 the State agency was faced with potential audit exceptions in excess of \$500,000, when Federal auditors determined that the law's fund matching procedures had not been followed properly in the case of the Racine Curative Workshop and a similar Madison project.

Wisconsin had amended its State plan in 1956 as a means of improving rehabilitation facilities in the State. The amendment reads in part:

The State funds required for the establishment of rehabilitation facilities will be obtained from contributions made by private organizations and/or individuals which will be deposited in the State revolving fund.

The regional office of the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation—now Vocational Rehabilitation Administration—indicated OVR approval of the amendment, and the Wisconsin agency proceeded under the extension and improvement sections of Public Law 565 in the belief that its operations were fully within the law. Arrangements were made in 1958 for construction of badly needed sheltered workshop facilities in the Racine area, and expansion of a Madison rehabilitation center was undertaken. Private organizations had donated money to the State agency for expansion of rehabilitation facilities in Wisconsin, and these funds served as the State's share of the State-Federal matching agreement.

This seemed natural enough. Under Hill-Burton Hospital Construction Act, this procedure was followed in hospital construction, communities providing matching funds. It was not until 1961 that Wisconsin learned the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare treated matching funds in two distinct ways. For hospitals under Hill-Burton, community participation was fine. For workshops and rehabilitation centers under Public Law 565, community participation was illegal. And just why the difference? Certain wording in Public Law 565 did lend itself to that rigid interpretation, and the first State to feel the bite was Wisconsin.

If the Racine project had been developed under Hill-Burton principles, the financial participation of the community would have been encouraged and accepted without question. This meant that two policies in basic opposition to each other existed in one Federal agency, and the resulting confusion was bound to result in a slowing down of the rehabilitation expansion intended by Public Law 565. For Wisconsin, a law that was designed to aid the disabled almost resulted in drastic curtailment of services to the disabled. The \$500,000 audit exceptions would have seriously impaired the Rehabilitation Division's functioning for many years.

In addition to sharply reducing case service, this interpretation of Public Law 565 would have dealt a damaging blow to the further development of sheltered workshops and rehabilitation centers in Wisconsin. The State legislature, pressed at every turn for departmental budget increases, has been unable to

allocate the money necessary to match all available Federal funds. The State funds appropriated must be used primarily in regular agency operation. This leaves the State in the ironic position of rejecting Federal funds as unmatchable, while at the same time rejecting requests for aid in establishing the sheltered workshops for which the Federal funds were earmarked. Communities requesting these facilities indicated substantial amounts were available to the State for matching Federal money. The local groups were amazed and confused to learn that though they built a general hospital on that basis, they could not establish or expand a sheltered workshop. This went against the grain of Wisconsin's philosophy of government which has always stressed the importance of cooperation at all levels between the statutory bodies and taxpaying public.

One of the pioneers in vocational rehabilitation, Wisconsin was a leader in expanding services into the more difficult disability areas prior to Public Law 565. And even greater expansion was planned under the 1954 law, particularly in the development of sheltered workshops and rehabilitation centers which are at the heart of modern rehabilitation programs.

Such development threatened to come to a halt as the result of the 1961 interpretations of Public Law 565. This would have been a tragedy of the first order for the disabled and was averted only by the Laird amendment of Public Law 565. Now it is not only possible to match the funds of the private non-profit agencies but the validity of the practice has been made retroactive to 1958, thus giving congressional endorsement to the procedures used in Wisconsin since that time.

Mr. Chairman, it should be realized that vocational rehabilitation service in any State is not complete with adequate sheltered workshops and medically oriented rehabilitation facilities. Certain categories of handicapped people can never be expected to enter and succeed in competitive employment. For this group, work opportunities must be provided that are compatible with the skills, aptitudes, and capacities of the individual.

Sheltered workshops provide a satisfactory solution to this problem, as they enable the worker to be profitably employed in a less demanding situation than would ordinarily be found in private industry. Another large group of handicapped people are unemployable because they have been hospitalized for varying lengths of time in mental hospitals and colonies for the mentally retarded. In many instances a short period of personal adjustment is all that is necessary to develop suitable attitudes and behavior patterns leading to competitive employment. These basic truths of rehabilitation were put forth in Public Law 565.

If workshop services are not available, over half of the handicapped population cannot enter proper rehabilitation programs. This problem has long been recognized by professional rehabilitation

workers, but in the absence of a State and Federal subsidy to lend impetus, the establishment of workshops has come slowly since it is entirely a local community responsibility. Unless an aggressive, energetic local group took the initiative, they were not developed.

Only 16 workshops are in operation in Wisconsin at present, together serving an average of about 1,000 persons daily, or just a small portion of the total in need of sheltered workshop services. With the exception of Racine, all of these enterprises have been established without the aid of Federal or State funds. They are doing an excellent job, to be sure, but they are really only touching the surface. At least triple the present number should be enrolled in workshop activity and would be if the service was available.

The following Wisconsin groups have indicated immediate interest in taking advantage of the matching provisions made possible by the Laird amendment: Curative Workshop of Milwaukee, Curative Workshop of Racine, and Curative Workshop of Green Bay, and Brown County Sheltered Workshop, all combination workshops and rehabilitation facilities; Fox River Valley Sheltered Workshop, Appleton; Holiday House, Manitowoc; Work Adjustment Services, Neenah; Opportunity Center, Sheboygan; Goodwill Industries, Milwaukee; Opportunity Center, Madison; Rock County Sheltered Workshop, Janesville; Christian League for the Handicapped, Walworth; Jewish Vocational Service, Milwaukee; DePaul Rehabilitation Center, Milwaukee, combination workshop and rehabilitation facility; Waukesha Training Center; Shelter for Handicapped, Eau Claire; St. John's School for the Deaf, Milwaukee; St. Mary's Hospital of Wausau, St. Camillus of Milwaukee, St. Luke's of Milwaukee, Mount Sinai of Milwaukee, and University Hospitals, Madison, all medically oriented rehabilitation facilities.

In response to a recent questionnaire, the above facilities indicated that approximately \$500,000 in local funds would be available during the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1965, if they could utilize Federal matching in an approximate ratio of 40 percent local to 60 percent Federal. This would mean a total expansion program of \$1,250,000, a tremendous boost to Wisconsin rehabilitation.

Indications are that the need for medically oriented rehabilitation facilities is not as acute in Wisconsin as in some areas. Many hospitals have developed adequate departments of physical medicine and rehabilitation which are doing an excellent job of meeting the medical rehabilitation needs of Wisconsin's handicapped. Rehabilitation authorities stress that what is needed the most is a comprehensive center which could offer both complete medical and vocational services.

Mr. Chairman, as I said earlier, the Laird amendment now makes possible the matching, under the vocational rehabilitation grants to States program, of contributed funds earmarked by the donor for the establishment of rehabili-

tation facilities and workshops. It opens up an important avenue for the support and development of rehabilitation facilities and workshops under private auspices.

Traditionally, most rehabilitation facilities and workshops have been started and operated under private auspices. We expect this practice to continue in the future. Consequently, this new resource for assisting in expanding rehabilitation facilities and workshops under private auspices will make a very real contribution toward increasing the resources needed for the rehabilitation of the disabled.

For a number of years, we have recognized joint public and private financing of the establishment of facilities as being one of the great untapped resources for developing better rehabilitation services for the disabled. This was recognized when authority to include rehabilitation facilities was added to the Hill-Burton Act in 1954. The proposed legislative program of the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration took this into account last year, but no final action on these proposals was taken in the last session of the Congress. Consequently, this amendment to the Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriation Act passed last summer, makes it possible to use both public and private resources far more speedily and effectively than would otherwise be the case.

A number of States, particularly those with insufficient public State funds to match all of the Federal funds allotted to them, will find the Laird amendment a good way to increase rehabilitation facilities and workshops in the State, at the same time appropriations are being raised by State legislatures, and thereby have the services available when money to purchase them is at hand.

Projects that could use somewhere around \$20 million in Federal funds next year have been identified by State rehabilitation agencies. These projects range from small additions to community workshops to extensive remodeling and expansion of comprehensive rehabilitation centers. The estimates range from no additional funds in eight States to \$1,140,000 in Ohio and \$1,340,000 in Washington.

Various kinds of projects are included in State estimates. For example, about 20 percent of the funds would come from Goodwill Industries for the expansion and improvement of sheltered workshops, including rehabilitation facility programs located in such workshops. About 6 percent of the funds would be for facilities focusing on the needs of the mentally retarded and about 10 percent would be located in schools and universities.

Care must be taken to insure orderly development of the expansion of resources through the establishment of rehabilitation facilities and workshops made possible by this new source of financing. It is also important that the continuance of good standards be assured.

What can be done effectively next year should be in keeping with the total in-

vestment for establishing rehabilitation facilities and workshops in the total State program, and assurance of community and State support for the people served should be forthcoming.

It is expected that under the Laird amendment new rehabilitation facilities will help fill the wide gaps now existing in services for the handicapped, not just in Wisconsin but throughout the Nation. New hope for the disabled grew out of Public Law 565. Now, as amended, the law provides still greater hope.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Rhode Island, with whom I have worked long and hard and for whom I have great respect, has stated that this bill was worked out in a spirit of compromise within our committee. Realizing full well the makeup of this Congress, I certainly believe that we have come out with the best kind of a compromise possible. I am proud of my support of the President of the United States in the committee on these appropriation items. I feel that this support can be evidenced in many other ways. At the present time down in the Department of Defense there is a new request being set up for some \$700 million of spending, on which request we are now holding hearings downstairs in the committee room. I had hoped that we could delay action on this Labor-HEW bill until we could be down there and listen to the testimony of the Secretary of Defense on this very important appropriation request.

During the quorum call period I went down to the subcommittee room and was disappointed to learn that there are no justifications for this particular request and that they will probably not be ready for a week or 10 days. After I found that out I realized that the place for me to be was here on the floor of this House, because I do not like to be any part of an appropriation hearing when there are no justifications available to consider.

Mr. Chairman, let me say that this particular bill is a bill which I believe every Member of this House of Representatives can support and, Mr. Chairman, I am sure they will support it when the roll is called later on this afternoon.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL].

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, you have heard a very able presentation, pretty much on a line item basis, by our good chairman, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY]. Some of the concern that we have on the minority side has been very ably expressed in the remarks of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD]. I think it should be pointed out, as many of you are aware, that this is really the fastest growing Department of the Government today, namely, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The biggest increases in appropriations over the past few years, with the possible exception of our space activities, have been in this area of health, education, and welfare. The bill here is for all practical purposes, an \$8 billion bill, or \$1 billion over the bill that we had before us last year. Our good chairman, Congressman FOGARTY, made mention of fact that it

is \$329 million under the budget request, and he did make the point that \$242 million of it is involved in grants to the States for public assistance. Personally I think this is a phony cut, because you recall several weeks ago, when we had the supplemental appropriation bill before the House we anted up \$407 million for additions in grants to the States in this public assistance area. So I suspect that notwithstanding all we have been doing in this general area through this legislation that we will still be coming back for supplementals, because many States have not taken appropriate action to clean up their programs, as was discussed by our good chairman, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY].

The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] raised the question as to what would be involved in supplemental requests, and as the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] so well phrased it, it is somewhere in the neighborhood of \$3 billion. I suspect that by the time we end up this fiscal year, 1966, we will have appropriations aggregating \$11 billion for HEW.

This does raise some concern, particularly to those of us who heard the President this morning in his personal appeal for the urgency of a \$700 million request to take care—and mind you, that is supposedly only for this current fiscal year—to take care of what is going on in South Vietnam. I could not help thinking this morning that maybe if the urgency is what the President declared it to be, we ought to be giving a lot more consideration and attention to these new programs we are enacting into law here, authorizing additional expenditures in this area of health, education, and welfare.

I think some of these programs are very fine, indeed. The chairman of our committee, I am sure, would support them to the ultimate, with the exception, possibly, of a time of openly declared war. But I am really concerned about it, because if it is \$700 million for South Vietnam for 2 months, May and June, it is quite conceivable that it will be \$5 billion for the next fiscal year if things do not get any better, and they look to be getting worse rather than better.

This is going to bring about a larger deficit; then we are going to have inflation, and several of us on the way back from the White House this morning felt that possibly we ought to mortgage everything and buy something in real property, so that we can hedge against the inflation that surely is in store for us.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHEL. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to state this to the gentleman. I believe the \$700 million special defense figure which was referred to and that the President spoke of this morning, when he said that this amount would be expended by June 30, I believe that is not the case. I just developed this point at some length with the Secretary of Defense. I think that there was an error in the President's remarks. This error has now been corrected in the hearing before the House Defense Appropriations Committee.

Mr. MICHEL. I am glad to have that correction for the record. There is no question, as you read our report and read the line items, you will find research—research—research. It seems to be the sacrosanct area, ever since the launching of sputnik. We have been devoting more and more time to education and research and I think to justify these increased amounts many of these agencies are coming up each year with requests simply for research and more research.

I want to point out for the Food and Drug Administration, for example, we have \$56 million in the bill. Do you know that that is an increase from \$14 million just 5 years ago, in 1960? Another subcommittee on which I serve, the Subcommittee for Agriculture, we deal with pesticides and research in that area. On the other side of the coin we find Food and Drug Administration. There is an amount of \$5.8 million for research, evaluation, and enforcement of pesticide control. So on one hand we appropriate for research on more and better pesticides in agriculture and through HEW we appropriate for research to control pesticides.

In the vocational education item we have \$262 million, an increase of \$104 million over last year. Some of us are of the opinion that maybe we are moving a little bit too fast in this area. Frankly, with all the attention that has been given to education and rehabilitation, the Job Corps and one thing and another, we hope this money will be spent wisely in this area.

In the area of higher education, facilities construction, we have no alternative. We have authorized the legislation, and now we have to ante up the money. This will show as an increase of \$178 million over last year and will provide full funding or a total of \$641,750,000.

In vocational rehabilitation we have an item of \$124 million which represents practically a \$24 million increase over last year.

Research and training in this item totals \$46 million.

Mr. Chairman, I am reminded of a call which I received on yesterday, a frantic call, from a mother of a 14-year-old girl who suffers from bulbar polio. She has been down at the Warm Springs Foundation for several months in each of the last 3 years and has been advised that they are strapped for money and this 14-year-old girl may be foreclosed from further help and assistance this year.

Mr. Chairman, this young lady is at that age, however, where she can apply for assistance through our vocational rehabilitation program. In Peoria, for example, we have one of the finest rehabilitation centers for the physically handicapped. Of course, here is one of those areas where we have Federal grants again to the States for a very important and vital program.

Mr. Chairman, our distinguished chairman of the subcommittee pointed out so well that most of this bill embodies simply grants-in-aid to the States and we are bound by certain formulas which, of course, we prescribe by legislative action here in the House of Representatives.

Personally, Mr. Chairman, I wish we could have cut some items and held others to a more reasonable figure, but as the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] pointed out so well, we had to compromise and it is in this spirit of compromise, that we come to you today with this bill and I stand by commitment to support it when it comes to a vote.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW].

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe there is any Member of this House who owes more to scientific research and research in medicine and the development of modern medicine than I do.

Mr. Chairman, some of my colleagues will remember not many years ago I was paralyzed and came onto this floor for many months in a wheelchair, and then on crutches. A few years after that, I had a coronary from which I have recovered and I feel I could challenge most anyone in this House in an athletic contest today.

But, Mr. Chairman, I owe much of this to the development of our health standards.

The gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] has made great contributions to these developments, as has the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] and their subcommittee. Those of us who have been beneficiaries of these developments owe much to them.

So, Mr. Chairman, it is a little difficult for me to stand here today in somewhat of a critical way of this bill. However, this has gotten to be something like the defense appropriation bill used to be, you just do not talk against it any more. But it seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that it is necessary for us to begin to look where we are going and what we are doing.

Mr. Chairman, the advocates of economy have been very quiet both in the public and the private sectors. People do not seem to care much any more about where we are going on this road of spending.

But, Mr. Chairman, this is an \$8 billion bill, \$8 billion, and as the gentleman from Wisconsin has said within a few weeks it will be much more. Before too long we are going to have a bill here almost as high as the bill for the Department of Defense.

Mr. Chairman, this bill was reported by the House Appropriations Committee and it has been publicized as cutting the budget by \$329 million, \$274 million in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and \$50.7 million in the Department of Labor.

Of the \$275 million cut in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, \$242.1 million is in the appropriation for grants to States for public assistance.

We are again in an annual situation. The budget request for public assistance comes to the Congress from the administration too low. Then Congress cuts it further to make its own record of cuts look good, then a supplemental budget estimate comes up from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare the following year to provide the money that should have been appropriated in the first place.

Last week we approved the conference report on the second supplemental appropriation bill, 1965, that provides \$407.9 million for public assistance. It was not in the regular annual appropriation bill last year for two reasons. The administration did not ask for enough money. Their estimate was short by just over \$200 million. The balance—the other \$200 million—was needed because of the congressional cut in the bill. So, when you look at this \$242 million reduction in this bill, I can say to you you are going to get it back in a supplemental, so this \$242 million, in my estimation, is not a true cut.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. LAIRD. I would like to join with the gentleman in his sentiment that this public welfare assistance program be reviewed. Personally, I believe this could be substantiated fully if the program was administered in all of the 50 States in accordance with many of the practices that are presently being followed. A very good staff of experts looked over this program some time ago. There was also a review here in the District of Columbia. They found in each case that the percentage of illegal payments or payments made to people who were not eligible in some jurisdictions was running as high as 30 percent. It would seem to me if the legislative committee does not go into this thoroughly and follow through with an investigation on the use of these welfare funds, and if they come back for more funds next year, I would hope that the Appropriations Committee would insist upon a full investigation of the use of these particular funds.

Mr. BOW. I agree with the gentleman, and I thank him for his contribution. We have been making investigations upon investigations on how these funds are being used, and we still have the practice of not appropriating enough, then they have to come back in a supplemental if it is a grant-in-aid, or matching funds, and what can we do about it? It seems to be the committees should get down and take a real hard look at it, or we are going to run into a difficult situation.

I have before me a report on why this was made, and if they follow through in this it will be fine. If we had an investigation to find out how this grant-in-aid money is used, it seems to me, for public assistance, we could get some place, but bear in mind this appropriation now calls for \$3 billion in grants-in-aid and public assistance compared with \$2,037 million in 1966. Think where we are going.

I recognize this committee has very little to do with it. The authorizing committees bring it in, and the gentleman says we will have more. The Public Health Service total in 1960 was \$841,263,000 grants for indirect health activities, yet this bill leaves \$796,018,000, which compares with \$2,047 billion in this bill for 1966. The increase since 1960 has been \$1,251 billion.

I can remember, Mr. Chairman, and I am sure many of you remember, Bob

Rich, who used to stand on this floor every day and ask "Where are you going to get the money? Where is the money coming from?" But nobody seems to care any more. There are a few, I admit.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for yielding. A member of the Subcommittee on Appropriations on the floor only a few moments ago, I believe, said that in 1954 the House spent a couple or 3 days in the consideration of this bill at that time holding it to slightly under approximately \$2 billion. Today it is \$8 billion. That represents the growth of the Health, Education, and Welfare Department bill. I join with the gentleman in saying, "Where is the money going to come from to pay the bills that are accruing against the taxpayers of this country today"—all of them? I am glad the gentleman mentioned the \$242 million. I tried to get an answer to that a while ago. Is this coming back to us in a few weeks or in a month or two? Will it come back to us again in a deficiency appropriation bill?

Mr. BOW. This has become an annual practice and I expect to see it again next year. I think we ought to be raising this question and talk about it and try to find out how we can find some way to cut down on the expenses of the grants-in-aid to the States. But instead of that we are authorizing more money all the time.

Mr. GROSS. One further question, if the gentleman will yield.

Is there any recognition in this bill in any way as to the money that was contained in the second supplemental appropriation bill? Does this bill give any recognition to the money that was appropriated in the second supplemental appropriation bill?

Mr. BOW. I do not recall that there was.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. LAIRD. Yes, it does, may I say in answer to the gentleman from Iowa. But that is all for the fiscal year 1965. I would like to point out one further thing though as part of the colloquy between the gentleman from Iowa and the distinguished ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow], and that is this. The medicare bill which passed this House the other day adds \$800 million to this very item that the gentleman is talking about. That medicare bill which was passed here adds in the area of child welfare and it adds in the area of maternal benefits—maternal and child welfare benefits. It changes the matching program under the Kerr-Mills bill through the incorporation of elder care provisions raising that matching amount so that there will be a supplemental request as soon as the other body acts, and instead of adding \$3 billion in this area as soon as the medicare bill passes the other body in general revenue, this figure

will be immediately increased in the fiscal year 1967.

Mr. BOW. The gentleman is absolutely correct. There is no question about it.

Mr. LAIRD. But the important thing is that those are the votes that count. That is where the increases are made.

Mr. BOW. It is the authorization that counts. I know exactly what the gentleman is suggesting with his questions and answers.

Now let us go back to this bill again. This bill takes credit for a cut of \$44 million in hospital construction activity from the \$303.4 million requested to \$259 million—\$13.2 million more than was appropriated for 1965.

Now the authorizing legislation for 1965 had a formula in it as to how much could be used for new construction and what could be used for remodeling. If the budget figure had been used, it would have been subject to a point of order. Therefore, it was cut down. But your actual cost of construction on this has not been reduced at all.

Now there has been some language on other Federal funds, but I shall not go into that, but we are getting to the point where we are losing control of matching funds. New formulas are being adopted.

This is exactly opposite to the views of the HEW budget officer on the requirement for matching of Federal funds by the States. During the hearings this year he said:

It seems to me that we depend upon a great number of things for protection and matching is one of them. If people put up a substantial part of their own funds, it gives the Federal Government some degree of protection that they are going to use their funds wisely. Therefore, if you are not putting up total funds, if half of the funds belong in the sponsoring agency, he is likely to have used a judgment that will keep it from being an extravagance.

That is in the record. I agree with the budget officer of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. In the House we are beginning to get away from matching funds, to get away from control. It seems to me we must take a closer look at this.

Since time is going on, I shall have to turn to some other matters.

Let me point out that in this bill there are increases over the budget estimates.

For the Bureau of Labor Standards, salaries and expenses, the amount is \$48,000.

For the Wage and Hour Division it is \$500,000.

For the Bureau of Employees Compensation, salaries and expenses, it is \$184,000.

These are all figures higher than the budget estimates.

For the Office of Education it is \$5 million.

For the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration it is \$200,000.

For the Public Health Service, buildings and facilities, it is \$1,650,000 higher than the budget estimates.

For injury control it is \$301,000 more than the budget estimates.

For chronic diseases and health of the aged the figure is \$5,250,000 more than the budget estimates.

For hospital construction activities it is \$1.5 million more than the budget estimates.

For air pollution it is \$1,634,000 more than the budget estimates.

For environmental engineering and sanitation it is \$549,000 more than the budget estimates.

For occupational health it is \$140,000 more than the budget estimates.

For radiological health the figure is \$226,000 more than the budget estimates.

For water supply and water pollution control it is \$3,913,000 more than the budget estimates.

The figure, for that particular one, is \$40,601,000, yet this is \$3,913,000 more than the budget estimates.

For hospitals and medical care it is \$864,000 over the budget estimates, and that is a figure of \$56,846,000.

For the National Institutes of Health, general services and research, it is \$1,250,000 over the budget estimates. That particular one involves \$58,719,000.

For the National Cancer Institute the figure is \$3,650,000 higher than the budget estimates, and that is \$149,968,000.

For the National Institute of Arthritis and Metabolic Diseases it is \$2 million over the budget estimates of \$119,203,000.

For St. Elizabeths Hospital, salaries and expenses, indefinite, it is \$133,000 over the budget estimates, and that figure is \$29,753,000.

For the American Printing House for the Blind it is \$91,000, and the budget estimate was \$909,000.

These are all items which have great appeal. They are good items. But when we look at the items in the budget and see the millions and millions of dollars, there is a question, "Why go over the budget estimates?"

Study of these items has been made by the Bureau of the Budget. Requests have been made by these divisions.

This gives me great concern.

Let us take a look at the last monthly statement of receipts and expenditures of the U.S. Government for the period from July 1, 1964, to March 31, 1965.

This reveals that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is spending at a rate of \$36,591,000 faster than in the same period in fiscal year 1964. This applies only to the administrative budget. So far this year the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has spent \$4,117,655,000 compared with \$4,081,064,000 in last year. This item is going up. It is constantly increasing.

They are doing great things in this division, but all of it cannot be done with money. It requires brains. It requires manpower. People must be hired. One cannot move too fast.

It seems to me this could have been cut down.

I am not going to offer amendments today to make reductions, but I would hope that in the future we could keep closer to the budget estimates, because this will get completely out of hand if we keep giving them money of this kind.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MICHEL. I believe it would be appropriate at this point to say that though I do not have all the figures for increased personnel for the entire bill, in one office, the Office of Education, this bill calls for more than 1,600 employees for the coming fiscal year, as compared to 1,165 in 1964. That is for the Office of Education.

Mr. BOW. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate the gentleman on his very thoughtful presentation. I know he has long given earnest and very fair and unbiased consideration to this problem. One of the problems we are facing throughout the country is the inability to keep our medical graduates from our various schools of medicine in the local areas. I am sure that the gentleman is finding in Ohio the same problem that we are finding in my own State of Indiana.

Mr. BOW. That is right.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. And in the course of a discussion of this subject not very long ago with some of the authorities from the State of Indiana, the statement was made that the Federal Government in its various activities is preempting so many of our medical graduates for one type of effort or another that they are not leaving enough of these qualified men who would otherwise become local practitioners in Indiana or in the gentleman's State of Ohio. I wonder if the gentleman would care to comment on that.

Mr. BOW. I think the gentleman is absolutely right. The Government is moving into this field and, it is true, in all areas of education. There are so many Government contracts being made with colleges and universities for everything that we are doing, that you have the professors from the universities working on theses and under contract for making reports to the Government and have students teaching now in the colleges and universities. The professors are doing this Government work on contract and are leaving the teaching to students. When the time comes I believe that we have to have a discussion about this at some time, because instead of having these employees of the Government do the job for us, all of this work is going out to the colleges. I have been utterly amazed at the increase in this sort of thing over the last 5 years, as shown by the studies being made now. In commerce alone it has gone up about fivefold. They are doing more and more of it, and they have gotten so busy now in the colleges and universities of this country, being paid by taxpayers' dollars to make reports to the U.S. Government, that the professors just do not have time to teach our children any more.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Will the gentleman yield to me further?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. In connection with his observations, I want to mention a fact that came to my attention recently with regard to the diversion of talents and efforts in our educational institutions in areas that are not considered normally to be their proper function as educational institutions. The figure was quoted to me that Massachusetts Institute of Technology, which I think is usually regarded as one of the outstanding engineering institutions in the country, today counts more than 80 percent of its total budget in terms of receipts from the Federal Government.

Mr. BOW. I agree with the gentleman. One thing I was going to say about some of these things going on at NIH is that I was particularly impressed by the one of the scientists going down now to South America and getting frogs and whistling to them and chucking them under the chin in order to get some serum or something from them by that process. I do not know whether it is necessary to teach our scientists to whistle to frogs and chuck them under the chin in order to attain some results.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. COLMER. The gentleman made some reference to an appropriation in excess of the budget request here.

Mr. BOW. Yes, I did.

Mr. COLMER. Can the gentleman tell us what the net result is in the entire bill?

Mr. BOW. My recollection is, on the items which I called to your attention, about \$34 million.

Mr. COLMER. I was wondering what the net difference is between the budget recommendations in the overall bill and the amount appropriated here.

Mr. BOW. Of course, the bill shows a reduction of about \$242 million, but I may say to the gentleman that I do not think it is a real reduction, because that comprises the contribution to the States and, as has happened every year, they will be back up here with a supplemental to pick that up. So I think it is actually \$34 million.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SHRIVER].

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the subcommittee I rise in support of H.R. 7765 which provides appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the 1966 fiscal year.

In this bill we are providing nearly \$8 billion for the operations of these departments with over \$7.3 billion budgeted for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The Committee on Appropriations has reduced the spending requests of the various departments by nearly \$330 million; but this bill provides \$261 million more than was appropriated for the 1965 fiscal year.

The departmental requests were thoroughly considered and reviewed by the committee. Our subcommittee conducted hearings from early February until the latter part of March. More than 4,000 pages of testimony are included in the printed hearings. I commend the chairman for his thoroughness, his energy and his dedication.

There is a candid discussion in the committee report on a number of the weaknesses and shortcomings relating to the budget activities of certain bureaus and agencies.

The bill includes \$3 billion for public assistance grants to States by the Welfare Administration. This is a reduction of 6 percent below the appropriation for 1965 and as has been said before, over \$242 million less than requested in the administration's budget.

This represents a modest decrease when we consider the expansion of programs under the social security program in 1962 which were aimed at reducing dependency; expansion of vocational rehabilitation programs designed to take people off welfare rolls; and in view of the massive spending advocated in the antipoverty programs.

The committee has made several significant restorations and additions in this appropriations measure. In the light of what appears to be a deemphasis of certain veterans programs by the administration, the committee has recommended restoration of a proposed \$427,500 cut in the funds of the Veterans Employment Service in the Labor Department budget. No new funds, however, are required. The Department will absorb this restoration.

The committee, and many of us in the Congress, are committed to those health programs that will lead us to new advances in the attack on major disease problems. Following testimony of medical and research authorities and by interested citizens and organizations across the Nation, the committee added funds over the budget request for the National Heart Institute to launch an artificial heart development program; an increase for the Institute of Arthritis and Metabolic Diseases to accelerate its research on various aspects of kidney disease; an increase for an intensified program of research on breast cancer by the National Cancer Institute; and restored \$2 million in the appropriation to continue the important undergraduate training program in medical and dental schools to advance the treatment of cancer.

Mr. REINECKE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHRIVER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. REINECKE. I am interested in some of these health research grants. From the testimony before the committee, is the committee basing these additional appropriations on results of past work or is this just a continuation of programs in the past? Do we have an effective evaluation method to know that we are getting something for these hundreds of millions of dollars that we are spending?

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Chairman, I think if the gentleman has carefully read



the hearings he will find that we have both.

Mr. REINECKE. Of course, I did not have a chance to read 4,700 pages of testimony, as the gentleman can well understand.

Mr. SHRIVER. I understand.

Mr. REINECKE. It is the gentleman's opinion that we are getting full value for the money that is being expended?

Mr. SHRIVER. Yes. Many of the advances that have been made in the area of health have been fully substantiated by appropriations made by the Congress in past years. The subcommittee felt definitely that we were getting value for the research that was being done.

One of the problems that I thought needed consideration was the dissemination of research information out over the country of research gains that have been made through the Department and the National Institutes of Health.

Mr. REINECKE. Do we have any agency that evaluates the effects of this research?

Mr. SHRIVER. Perhaps the chairman will answer that.

Mr. FOGARTY. Well, the Institutes of Health, they have the General Accounting Office, they have two congressional committees looking over their shoulders out there all the time, and their activities are reported to the Congress.

They had a blue-ribbon committee appointed which has just made a report.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. SHRIVER. I thank the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. FOGARTY. If the gentleman will yield further, they have a special committee that just reported to the Congress 4 or 5 weeks ago. They have the President's Committee on Science and Technology. They have about six or seven groups looking over their shoulders all the time and everyone has given the Institutes a clean bill of health.

Mr. REINECKE. Are these administrative committees or technical committees?

Mr. FOGARTY. They are both administrative committees and technical committees as well as task force committees set up by the President of the United States.

Mr. REINECKE. I thank the gentleman from Kansas for yielding.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHRIVER. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. MORTON. Could the gentleman tell me out of \$100,000 of research grant money that is to be appropriated within this bill for these specific research programs, what portion of that money is overhead and what portion of it actually is used by technical people engaged in the research projects involved?

Mr. SHRIVER. I do not recall that we had it broken down in proportions, unless the chairman recalls the specific testimony.

Mr. FOGARTY. If the gentleman will yield further, all of the medical schools in the country have reached an agreement that they spend an average of 30 percent for overhead. The Defense Department's expense for overhead runs up to something like 40 percent or 45 percent. This is a very small amount.

Mr. MORTON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. SHRIVER. Throughout the committee hearings it was particularly gratifying to me to hear various witnesses point up the leadership of my own State, the State of Kansas, particularly in the fields of mental health and education. It is always good to hear good reports concerning our own areas.

Mr. Chairman, we are asked to appropriate substantial moneys here today. And there is heavy emphasis upon existing health and education programs. However, there are many new programs which have been authorized.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. SHRIVER. I thank the gentleman from Rhode Island. As I stated, Mr. Chairman, there are many new programs which have been authorized and others awaiting action which will have even a greater impact upon the Federal Treasury.

The administration has requested a substantial increase of \$1.3 billion in spending next year for the poverty program. While the much-heralded economic development program for Appalachia is not yet off the ground, plans are under way to initiate similar regional programs in other areas throughout the Nation.

The impact of new social security legislation, including the medicare program, is not yet reflected in the trust fund appropriation of the Social Security Administration. However, the expenditures from the Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund will increase by nearly \$1.4 billion next year.

It has been stated many times before, but as we consider this appropriation measure it bears repeating: it is difficult to hold the line on spending after a program has been authorized by the Congress. We have a responsibility to the taxpayers of the Nation to effect meaningful economies at the time authorization legislation is considered in the House.

Mr. Chairman, the Appropriations Committee has done its best to seek full justification for the budget requests which are subject to House action today.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE].

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, at the outset I want to take this opportunity to congratulate the chairman and the subcommittee for the fine work they have done in bringing forth this bill to the House.

I would like to ask the chairman, however, about the item with regard to the

public library grant program for fiscal year 1966.

It was my feeling that Mr. Keppel of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare had asked for \$75 million in order to carry out this program.

Mr. FOGARTY. If the gentleman will yield, the Department of Education asked for \$75 million and the Budget Bureau cut this request by \$20 million. We gave the full amount that was authorized by the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. CONTE. One other question. As I understand it from reading the hearings, the chairman felt that the library programs ought to reach \$155 million. The committee report indicates an estimated need of \$400 million just to build the needed public library space.

Mr. FOGARTY. There are some very high figures involved, but I do not remember that one. I might have said twice as much. I had in mind they had \$140 million worth of applications for construction of libraries that could be used out of the appropriated funds.

Mr. CONTE. I agree with the chairman, and I realize that \$155 million would be a barebone figure to carry out this program. I think it is a lot more important to build our libraries and teach our children, rather than spending money in other ways around the country.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to express a word of regret and dismay over the decision of the administration to short-change the vital public library program contained in this appropriation bill. I think we have here another classic example of the fundamental inconsistency between the thrilling rhetoric we get from the White House and the true mood and attitude of the President toward the honest needs of the Nation.

I feel strongly enough about this library matter that I would like to at least spell out the facts for the taxpayers—the same taxpayers, I might add, who are being asked to pay for such activities as a colossal gardening program in Washington and the most stupendous sectional pork barrel windfall of all time, the Appalachia program, which, I must confess, I am still at something of a loss to explain to my constituents.

I will not burden this body or waste its time with a harangue on the virtues of education and the merits of the broadest possible free library facility. I will rely on the good judgment and sincere concern for the Nation's welfare, which I am certain each of us feels in full measure. But I would like to call attention to some of the facts and figures in regard to the library appropriation.

The Office of Education framed a request for \$75 million for its public library grant program in fiscal 1966. The request was the distillation of, first, the fact that State and local funds available under the matching provisions of this program, at present far exceed the Federal Government's available funds. Further, the indications are that even more matching funds at the State and local level will be available in fiscal 1966. Thirdly, we have the estimate that some

\$400 million is presently needed for construction alone, which does not include books, staff, maintenance, and upkeep merely to meet our present requirements.

These facts notwithstanding, the Bureau of the Budget chopped the amount requested for public library grants to \$55 million.

I am disappointed to note that the Appropriations Committee upheld this cut and has reported out an appropriation of only \$55 million for this important program. I am disappointed, because I have read the testimony and the statements, and I have noted the sympathy for this program on the part of the members of the subcommittee and its fine chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY].

During the hearings, the gentleman expressed amazement over the fact that \$20 million had been scrubbed out of the library program by the administration. I echo his amazement.

I might also point out that the gentleman expressed the feeling during his hearing on this matter that the appropriation ought to be \$155 million instead of \$55 million. I can echo his sentiments on this point too, and I am delighted to note his enthusiasm for this vital activity.

Mr. Chairman, it is a matter of legislative record that this library grant program has been among the most popular programs of its kind in each of the States. It has been popular because it is an honest, effective, worthwhile program which has yielded tangible benefits. I agree with the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island that it is wrong to cut this program.

What is the use of creating such programs if they are not to be supported? The library program was extended last year by act of this Congress in response to a request from the administration. The administration was happy enough to take credit for it, as was right and proper. But I wonder how happy the administration is to assume the blame for betraying the promise it makes on the one hand by sapping the strength to fulfill it on the other.

I think what we have here is another example of this administration's manipulation of the books in an effort to work miracles for us while still keeping the budget under that mystical \$100 billion ceiling.

The administration is juggling the books and the victims are the taxpayers. Let us not kid ourselves and let us not kid the taxpayers. Let us not be deluded by the promise that the Great Society is going to cleanse us of ignorance and poverty completely free of charge. It cannot be done. We get only what we pay for. What we are unwilling to pay for, we are going to have to do without. I submit that this public library program is something we can ill afford to sacrifice on the altar of false economy.

I think it is high time we applied a little practical commonsense to some of these proposals. I am all in favor of green grass and pretty flowers—I have

spent enough time in my own backyard trying to get these things to grow—but I wonder, on the balance, whether these are important enough to warrant the administration's austerity posture on such vital issues as support for the Nation's free public libraries.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may desire to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON].

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I am very anxious to ask a question or two, and am glad of this opportunity to do so.

In the matter of mental health: I wonder if this committee has made any study at all of the rather extraordinary work that is being done in Princeton in psychiatry in the building of the hospitals for the mentally ill, and in the treatment of the mentally ill?

Mr. FOGARTY. We do not have all specific projects brought to our attention, because we do not pass on specific projects. These are funded after applications from the universities are submitted and approved and unless funds are earmarked in this appropriation bill we do not always hear about the work that is being carried on in the many different institutions under thousands of different grants.

Mrs. BOLTON. I have been living under a delusion. I thought your committee was one having oversight over these various studies and various methods of going forward with them.

Mr. FOGARTY. No. They have the best people in the country operating the National Institutes of Health.

Mrs. BOLTON. Who does the gentleman mean by "they"?

Mr. FOGARTY. The Government. The Science Foundation, the Defense Department, and almost every other agency in Government with a large research grant program has followed the formula established by the National Institutes of Health because that has been determined by people in this area to be the best form up to this point.

Mrs. BOLTON. Then the National Institutes of Health is responsible?

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. BOLTON. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. LAIRD. I would like to add to the comments made by the chairman of the subcommittee. This program at Princeton is financed through grants from the National Institute of Mental Health. Princeton is taking part in this program and I expect they will continue in 1966. I have not reviewed the Princeton project thoroughly. It is my understanding they will be funded further in the fiscal year 1966.

Mrs. BOLTON. Only through 1966? If one wants to find out, one should go to the NIH, or where?

Mr. LAIRD. I can say to the gentlewoman this approval would be by the Council.

Mrs. BOLTON. What council?

Mr. LAIRD. The National Advisory Council on Mental Health is the council that reviews these applications, and the continuation of this program is decided by the Council. I can assure the gentlewoman from Ohio this is in the approved

category, as I understand it. I will check on this so that we have the correct information, but I can assure the gentlewoman there are funds in the bill for this program if the Council approves it.

Mrs. BOLTON. I was wondering who passes on them?

Mr. LAIRD. The Council which is appointed by the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, Dr. Luther Terry. These councils are recommended by the Director of the National Institute of Mental Health and submitted to the Director of the National Institutes of Health, Dr. Shannon, and finally appointments are made by the Surgeon General of the United States with the approval of the Secretary of HEW. These are all eminent, well-qualified people in the various areas. The Council on Mental Health passes on all of these particular applications and I shall place in the RECORD at this point the names of members of the Council.

#### NATIONAL ADVISORY MENTAL HEALTH COUNCIL

Dr. Jack R. Ewalt (65), professor of psychiatry, Harvard Medical School, Boston, Mass.

Dr. Louis S. Goodman (66), professor and head, Department of Pharmacology, University College of Medicine, Salt Lake City, Utah.

Mr. Mike Gorman (65), executive director, National Committee Against Mental Illness, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

Dr. George C. Ham (65), professor of psychiatry, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, N.C.

Mrs. Geraldine Joseph (67), 5 Red Cedar Lane, Minneapolis, Minn.

Dr. Paul V. Lemkau (68), professor of mental hygiene, School of Hygiene and Public Health, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.

Mr. J. Quigg Newton, Jr., (68), president, Commonwealth Fund, 1 East 75th Street, New York, N.Y.

Dr. Charles R. Strother (67), professor of psychology and director, Pilot School, University of Washington, Seattle, Wash.

Senator Robert D. Williams (66), the senate, California Legislature, State Capitol, Sacramento, Calif.

Dr. Robin M. Williams, Jr. (67), professor of sociology, Department of Sociology, Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y.

Dr. Cecil L. Wittson (66), dean, College of Medicine, University of Nebraska, Omaha, Nebr.

#### EX OFFICIO MEMBERS

Dr. Luther L. Terry (Chairman), Surgeon General, Public Health Service, Washington, D.C.

Dr. John J. Blasko, Director, Psychiatry, Neurology, and Psychology Service, Veterans' Administration, Washington, D.C.

Capt. Ralph L. Christy, Medical Corps, U.S. Navy, Head, Neuropsychiatry Branch, Bureau of Medicine and Surgery, Navy Department, Washington, D.C.

Mrs. BOLTON. I thank the distinguished gentleman very much as well as the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY].

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the very distinguished member of our subcommittee, Mr. MATTHEWS, from the great State of Florida.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate the distinguished chairman of our subcommittee for the

magnificent work he has done and to say how much I have enjoyed working with the Members on both sides of the aisle on this particular appropriation bill.

Mr. Chairman, when I first assumed my duties on this subcommittee dealing with the medical sciences after having served 10 years with the Committee on Agriculture, I told the distinguished doctors who were visiting us one day that I felt like the gentleman of whom my colleague from Florida [Mr. ROGERS] told about one day some years ago.

This gentleman was a porter in a drugstore and all in the world he had to do was to sweep the floor. He never asked any questions. He never answered any questions. All he did was sweep the floor. But on this particular occasion, the owner of the drugstore had to leave a little bit earlier so he called the porter and he said, "Now, John, all you have to do is close the door when you get through sweeping. Do you understand?" The porter said, "Yes, sir." The owner closed the door and left. The telephone rang. The porter went to the telephone and he said, "Hello." A voice on the other end of the wire said, "Do you have Aureomycin, streptomycin—penicillin?" The porter said, "Hello." and the voice at the other end of the wire repeated, "Do you have Aureomycin, streptomycin—penicillin?" The porter said, "Boss, when I told you 'hello,' I told you everything I know."

So I had somewhat that feeling about these medical terms when I first began to discuss this important bill. But it was not long before it made sense to me. I have thoroughly enjoyed my association with this great committee.

Mr. Chairman, I want to call particular attention to page 11 of the committee report to a statement concerning compliance with the Civil Rights Act. I quote from the report of the committee:

The committee recommends that there be developed, at the Washington level, a more expeditious way of processing applications which have been forwarded by local, State, and district school boards signifying compliance with the Civil Rights Act. The committee has received information indicating that there have been undue delays in processing these applications.

I have had extensive conversations with our State superintendent of public instruction in Florida, Hon. Thomas D. Bailey, about this problem.

Superintendent Bailey has reported to me that our county school boards and superintendents have faced the matter of complying with the Civil Rights Act with a high degree of responsibility. They have endeavored to follow the law and the directives of the U.S. Office of Education to the best of their ability. In spite of some disagreement with the Civil Rights Act, their morale has been high and their approach to solving the problems promises to be effective. However, the patience of our people has its limits, and the morale in complying with the Civil Rights Act is likely to be completely destroyed, owing to the fact that it seems to be impossible to get action, decisions, and information from the U.S. Office of Education.

After many, many days and weeks of effort, the statement of compliance by

the Florida State Board of Education was finally approved by the Commissioner of Education on Wednesday, April 14, thus enabling Florida to channel certain Federal funds to eligible county school systems and to secure approval of State plans for vocational education and other programs. We, of course, are grateful to Commissioner Keppel and his assistants for this favorable action, but it is just one little step forward. While we take this one little step forward, we take, I am afraid, two steps back, because we have not solved the problem of getting approvals for channeling Federal funds and federally subsidized services to our county school systems and our other educational institutions.

We in Florida have three principal problems.

First, our public junior colleges and two of our county school systems, Dade and Charlotte, signed HEW form No. 441, assurance of compliance with the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Under advice from the U.S. Office of Education personnel that there was no alternative for them to sign form No. 441 and also on the assurance that it was proper for them to do so, our junior colleges executed this form. Dade and Charlotte County school boards executed the form on the basis that they were in good faith desegregated. According to regulations and instructions sent out by the U.S. Office of Education, county school systems and institutions which have properly executed form No. 441 are eligible to participate in federally subsidized educational programs without restriction or question. However, it is my understanding that Superintendent Bailey has been advised by telephone from the U.S. Office of Education that Florida should not channel funds and services to these institutions and counties until further notice from the U.S. Office of Education. Now, these counties and colleges apparently have complied with all requirements of law and regulations, and I think they should be advised that they are in order, or notified specifically that they are not and why they are not, so they can plan accordingly.

Let me point out another problem facing us in Florida. School districts which are not fully desegregated or under court order for desegregation are permitted under U.S. Office of Education regulations to submit plans of compliance leading to desegregation. Such plans have been submitted by 52 of the 67 counties, the earliest under date of February 5 and the latest on March 12. Approval of these plans by the U.S. Office of Education is necessary if these counties are to continue to participate in Federal funds. As of the last time I talked with Superintendent Bailey—I emphasize, this was on April 19, and there may have been some changes since, but I doubt it—Florida had received no official notice whatsoever concerning the acceptability or nonacceptability of any of these 52 plans of compliance. Our people have been told informally by telephone that two plans have been found acceptable, and two have been found unacceptable, but no official word has been received about any plan. Thus, our county school

boards are left in the position of not knowing which way to turn. They cannot work on revising their plans, if they are not in good order, because they have not been notified that they are unacceptable. Most of these plans provide for notices to parents and pupils before the end of the present school year. With the approach of the closing of schools, time is running out to implement these plans this year, even if they are found to be acceptable. This is developing into an impossible situation for our county school boards in Florida. An early decision on these 52 plans, one way or the other, is imperative.

Let me emphasize now, the third problem. We in Florida are asking the U.S. Commission of Education for a favorable ruling that expenditures will be valid for National Defense Education Act audit and matching purposes, provided they are made subsequent to the submission of plans for compliance to the State Department of Education for transmission to the U.S. Office of Education, even though this date may precede the date when final approval of the plan for compliance is given by the U.S. Office of Education. If a favorable ruling on this is not received, our county school systems and other institutions will lose very large amounts of Federal money for education, and their educational programs will be damaged. Let me emphasize that students of all races, colors and creeds will suffer. Our people in Florida have been advised by personnel in the Office of Education who are responsible for administering the Civil Rights Act that this proposal does not affect the civil rights aspect of their program, but relates only to the accountability for the funds.

I think, then, Mr. Chairman, that the statement of the committee is certainly an understatement of fact. Surely we need at the Washington level a more expeditious way of processing applications which have been forwarded by local, State and district school boards signifying compliance with the Civil Rights Act. I hope the appropriate authorities will take this suggestion of the committee to heart and will give people all over America much prompter action in this important matter.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATTHEWS. I will be delighted to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I do not understand the use of the word "applications" in this connection, because libraries in my district have been served with notice that they must sign not applications but an "assurance of compliance." They are not called applications. The title of the form, as issued by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, is "Assurance of Compliance." I do not understand where the committee in its report on page 11 gets the word "applications."

Mr. MATTHEWS. Let me point out the action of the committee was directed toward the Office of Education. What the gentleman is talking about is connected with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Mr. GROSS. That is correct.

Mr. MATTHEWS. And that problem was not called to our attention.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY].

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I have noted with approval the statement contained in the committee report, on page 25, which points up that the Congress has a right to expect the executive branch to present a forward-looking budget. This report points up further that such a budget should provide for the growing capability of science, as well as the increasing cost and sophistication of our scientific effort. This report goes on to state that in the absence of adequate budget estimates, it is necessary for the committee to examine the real needs of the programs.

I do not think, Mr. Chairman, that anyone familiar with my voting record will accuse me of being overliberal when it comes to appropriations; but I want to state here and now that I fully support the committee statement with regard to adequate budget estimates, and feel that, while Congress should cut out waste, it has an equal responsibility to add funds for necessary programs.

In this connection, I want to say that I note with approval that the committee has added funds not requested in the budget for several new programs having to do with the health needs of our time and our country. I refer, for example, to the fact that the committee has included \$2½ million over the budget request for the National Heart Institute, to launch an artificial heart development program. In other words, Mr. Chairman, I believe there is an immediate need for an artificial heart device which can be safely used, and that in spite of the fact that the budget request failed to ask for funds for developing some new equipment along this line, funds should be provided, and I am glad they are provided in this legislation for this purpose.

Likewise, Mr. Chairman, I fully support the inclusion of \$2 million in this bill, over the budget request, for the Institute of Arthritis and Metabolic Diseases, to accelerate research on hemodialysis and related methods of blood and lymph purification, and for studies on the uremic syndrome. The testimony fully supports the need and desirability of funds for developing new methods in connection with kidney failure.

Mr. Chairman, I have observed firsthand these methods developed in recent years which permit the saving of lives of patients who have suffered the loss of kidney function, through the repeated use of the kidney machine. This technique, while expensive and limited in its capacity, is available at the University of Washington Medical Center, and likewise, at the Swedish Hospital in my congressional district in Seattle. The equipment and artificial kidney facilities are constructed in my district; in fact, originally pioneered in Seattle and I know firsthand that people are being kept alive and leading normal lives who otherwise, because they have lost the use of their kidneys, could not survive.

So, as I say, in spite of the fact that these new programs are not in the budget, I commend the committee for providing additional funds for these specific new programs.

It is as simple as this, Mr. Chairman, these increases will enable many of our citizens to live useful and purposeful lives; failure to provide these increases will, in effect, condemn a number of afflicted people to death. So, as I say, I express my appreciation to the committee for providing these funds, even though the President had not requested them.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 22:

BUREAU OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY,  
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for the general administration of the employment service and unemployment compensation programs; performing functions under the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, as amended; and administration of the Farm Labor Contractor Registration Act of 1963; \$2,160,000, together with not to exceed \$15,434,000 which may be expended from the employment security administration account in the unemployment trust fund, of which \$1,708,000 shall be for carrying into effect the provisions of title IV (except section 602) of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to ask a question of the chairman of the committee. I see that on page 5 the committee put in a statement in its report concerning the domestic farm labor program. We in Florida have had great difficulty, particularly now and in the preceding days, during the current harvest. I have found that the Bureau of Employment Security is a very difficult agency to deal with. They have been most unrealistic and most unhelpful in trying to handle adequate farm labor for Florida. Everyone agrees domestic labor ought to be hired first if available, but after that there is a law which the Congress passed and which is now on the books, Public Law 414, which says that if domestic labor is not available, then the Secretary may administer this with the Attorney General. I want to ask the chairman if this was the understanding of the committee as to the intent of Congress.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I yield to the chairman.

Mr. FOGARTY. That is the understanding of the committee, I might say, and that is why we put this language in the report that if domestic labor is not available for perishable fruits to be picked, which have to be picked in a 2- or 3-week period, let us say, then we expect to make some exceptions along this line and I understand that this situation has been in effect in three or four States during the past 3 or 4 weeks.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I thank the gentleman. I would like to bring to

the attention of the Secretary of Labor who, I hope, will read this Record, that we do need some help in the celery crop and the sweet corn crop in Florida. For the Secretary's benefit I want to quote the committee:

The committee agrees that foreign labor should not be imported if there is capable domestic labor available to do the job. However, the timely availability of labor for the harvesting of perishable agricultural products is essential. Lack of it can mean bankruptcy for individual farmers and shortages and higher prices for consumers. Timely availability of labor under current circumstances cannot be assured with the domestic farm labor programs we have had in the past.

I agree completely with the statement the committee has made in its report. I hope the Secretary of Labor will act now before it is too late to do something about getting the proper kind of labor to these farmers who have the crops ready to harvest. I hope this will spur the Secretary to some action.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I want to apologize to the Committee for rising so soon after I have already spoken just a few minutes ago. But I want to take this opportunity to thank the chairman of our subcommittee, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY], for the amount of time that he gave us to discuss this particular problem in our subcommittee.

I want to say to my colleague from Florida [Mr. ROGERS]—and I notice here the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HALEY] and others of us from Florida who are particularly interested in this problem of adequate farm labor that we interrogated Secretary Wirtz at great length. Of course, this is a very serious problem. We all know that. There are good men on both sides of this issue, but I said to Mr. Wirtz that we in Florida feel that we simply cannot get enough domestic labor to harvest our crops. I pleaded with him to help us in every way he possibly could to see that we got enough domestic labor and if we could not get enough domestic labor, not to close the door to offshore labor.

The committee included all of the funds that we felt Secretary Wirtz needed to try to recruit ample domestic labor. I am very grateful for that fact. But I want to say very frankly, and just as forcefully as I can, Mr. Chairman, that I just do not believe that this problem is going to be solved by domestic labor alone. That is my own personal opinion. And I think that is the opinion of the majority of our farm producers in the State of Florida.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATTHEWS. I yield to my colleague from Florida.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, may I say to my good friend from Florida that this is a serious problem not only in the State of Florida but in many other parts of the Nation. Many States are having the same problem. We must have a practical understanding of what is involved here. At certain times of the year in the gathering of perishable crops

it is necessary to have a tremendous amount of labor, and unless you have it at the particular time you can lose a whole season's work. I, too, hope that the Secretary will be practical about this matter and not only give some relief to Florida but to our great sister State of California and to many other parts of our great Nation.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATTHEWS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. I thank the gentleman from Florida and all of the gentlemen from Florida for having brought this problem once more to the attention of the membership of the House of Representatives.

I have spoken often here and made this same point many, many times.

I have just returned from California and I would like to relate this situation to the Members of the House. As I predicted and said so often, the press and people who say that imported labor is brought here as slave labor and labor only for the use and the interest and profit of large corporate farmers, are entirely wrong. The large corporate farmers in California at least are doing pretty well. They are outbidding the little farmers in piece rates and they can afford to mechanize. They are and have been for some time providing adequate housing and they are fairly well.

However, it is the little farmer, the family farmer, and the people we have been bleeding for for so long in this House, at least in California, who are going to suffer and suffer very, very heavily this year and for several years to come.

Mr. Chairman, I repeat, it is not the big farmers that are hurting. It is the little farmers.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I thank the gentleman for his observation.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATTHEWS. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. After the appearance of the Secretary, Mr. Wirtz, before your committee, did you arrive at any conclusions or did he give you anything in the way of encouragement with reference to this problem? I would like to have a response from the gentleman as to how Secretary Wirtz responded to the gentleman's inquiry.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I must say that he felt that in the near future we could do without any labor other than domestic labor. But I will say that he assured us that he would approach this matter with fairness. Since that time, of course, he has been to our own State of Florida, but it is Secretary Wirtz' belief I believe that in the very near future we are not going to need any labor other than domestic labor, and it is on that issue that I disagree with him.

Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I would just like to say on this issue that there are a number of Members who are concerned with this

problem. However, I believe we can assure the membership that this subcommittee has fulfilled its responsibilities fully in this field of farm labor. I believe we have given each dollar that was requested by the Secretary in order to carry out his domestic recruitment program.

The gentleman from Florida and myself and other Members, as well as the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], are vitally interested in this and we expressed our opinion to the Secretary that while we were not confident that he would be able to fully meet the needs of agricultural labor from domestic sources, if he were unable to do so, we did not want it to be because this subcommittee had denied to him \$1 of the funds which he said were necessary.

We urged him, and I think the Secretary is well aware of the extreme importance of agricultural labor in gathering the crops off the trees, as in the case of my State, or gathering the crops off the plants as is the case in the other States at the time they are at their maximum peak for harvesting.

Mr. Chairman, there are many more jobs involved in this problem than just the jobs of people who harvest the crops. There are transportation jobs and jobs in the canneries and there are distribution jobs and indeed the whole field of consumer relations is involved.

I believe we can assure this House that this committee has fully fulfilled its responsibilities.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I agree with the gentleman and share the gentleman's concern about what is happening in this particular area. We in the State of Michigan are concerned particularly with the pickle growers. It is not a big commodity but it is one of concern in our area. The pickle farmers are unable to get the people necessary to handle this crop, and unless something is done there is going to be a tremendous loss. As the gentleman pointed out, there are people who work in canneries that are involved. So, unless the Secretary of Labor makes some change in his present attitude, I feel we are going to have a real economic loss to many farmers in the State of Michigan and the stoop labor just is not available to do the job.

As far as we are concerned, if the Secretary of Labor can find them, we would be glad to have them to do the job.

Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon. I think everyone in this room will agree that the jobs ought to be performed by American labor if American labor can be found to do the job. It is the purpose of these appropriations under discussion at the present time to assist the Secretary in locating and bringing to the field the necessary domestic labor. If it is available I am certain the Secretary will fulfill his responsibility to see that the crops are harvested.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to make inquiry about the funds and the distribution of funds for manpower development and training activities. It seems to me this is one of the programs that we have that has great potential for good in operating and increasing the training of our people. Yet, I understand there are some complaints about the question of whether these funds are being distributed to the States on the basis of the formula that was contemplated by the original substantive legislation. I see where we are appropriating in this bill \$273,500,000 for this purpose. I am wondering how this is to be allocated between the States, and whether it is being allocated in accordance with the fundamental formula that was anticipated in the substantive legislation.

Mr. FOGARTY. I may say briefly that these funds are distributed on a formula basis, mainly on population. If some of the States do not take advantage of these funds then the Secretary can distribute them to other States that have applications pending. As I understand it, this redistribution is made almost automatically. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] has made a thorough study of this and knows more about it than I do. Maybe he can give you a better answer.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. LAIRD. I appreciate the compliment of the gentleman, but I assure the House that the gentleman from Rhode Island does know more. No one knows as much about this as he does.

As far as the distribution formula is concerned, there have been amendments made to this distribution formula. It provides no allocation can be made until after the first two quarters of the fiscal year. The Department of Labor has not followed through on its commitment to the Committee on Education and Labor in this area. This year they went ahead and made distributions by which at least one State received 500 percent of its allocation under the law, while there were applications pending in other States that had not received even 50 percent. In the testimony before the Committee on Education and Labor a record was made last year that this would not happen. We have admonished the Department of Labor not to follow this practice again, and I would hope no allocation or redistribution is made until after the third quarter of the fiscal year 1966. The gentleman from Wisconsin is entirely right, this allocation formula has not been followed properly by the Labor Department. I am sure, in view of the interest we have expressed in this whole program, that they will not follow this procedure again.

I would like to include at this point the allocation that will be made for the fiscal year 1966 on the basis of the appropriations in this bill. Of course, these figures are pretty much illustrative since they are based on the old law. We will get revised figures when we have hearings on the supplemental in a few weeks.

*Estimated distribution of funds for training and allowances under title II of the Manpower Development and Training Act for fiscal year 1966 (based upon one-third State matching of institutional training costs and trainee allowances)*

[In thousands of dollars]

State	Total estimated funds <sup>1</sup>	Estimated Federal funds	Estimated State funds
U.S. total.....	340,195	245,861	94,334
Alabama.....	4,729	3,417	1,311
Alaska.....	680	492	189
Arizona.....	1,905	1,377	528
Arkansas.....	2,585	1,869	717
California.....	41,640	30,093	11,546
Colorado.....	3,538	2,557	981
Connecticut.....	4,967	3,590	1,377
Delaware.....	782	565	217
District of Columbia.....	1,361	983	377
Florida.....	6,736	4,868	1,868
Georgia.....	5,545	4,008	1,538
Guam.....	68	49	19
Hawaii.....	1,089	787	302
Idaho.....	1,395	1,008	387
Illinois.....	19,187	13,867	5,320
Indiana.....	6,668	4,819	1,849
Iowa.....	4,354	3,147	1,207
Kansas.....	3,742	2,704	1,038
Kentucky.....	5,545	4,008	1,538
Louisiana.....	5,069	3,663	1,406
Maine.....	1,327	959	368
Maryland.....	4,286	3,098	1,189
Massachusetts.....	12,213	8,826	3,387
Michigan.....	13,370	9,662	3,707
Minnesota.....	6,226	4,499	1,726
Mississippi.....	3,368	2,434	934
Missouri.....	7,926	5,729	2,198
Montana.....	1,089	787	302
Nebraska.....	2,279	1,647	632
Nevada.....	714	516	198
New Hampshire.....	987	713	274
New Jersey.....	14,696	10,621	4,075
New Mexico.....	1,225	885	340
New York.....	38,918	28,127	10,792
North Carolina.....	6,226	4,499	1,726
North Dakota.....	1,269	910	349
Ohio.....	19,085	13,793	5,292
Oklahoma.....	3,334	2,409	924
Oregon.....	3,470	2,568	962
Pennsylvania.....	23,848	17,235	6,613
Puerto Rico.....	3,096	2,237	858
Rhode Island.....	1,633	1,180	453
South Carolina.....	3,470	2,568	962
South Dakota.....	1,191	861	330
Tennessee.....	5,443	3,934	1,509
Texas.....	13,642	9,859	3,783
Utah.....	1,667	1,205	462
Vermont.....	782	565	217
Virginia.....	4,625	3,270	1,255
Virgin Islands.....	68	49	19
Washington.....	5,851	4,229	1,623
West Virginia.....	2,722	1,967	755
Wisconsin.....	7,858	5,679	2,179
Wyoming.....	816	590	226

<sup>1</sup> Based upon fiscal year 1965 apportionment factors. Public Law 84-415, sec. 310, requires annual redetermination of State apportionment factors.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. The gentleman does feel that the committee has assurances that at least in the coming fiscal year the allocation of this \$273 million appropriated here will be in accord with the formula, and that there will not be this distribution to States that already have had their fair share until all of the applications have been processed.

Mr. LAIRD. I believe the Department of Labor will follow that procedure, and we urge them to do that.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF INTERNATIONAL LABOR AFFAIRS  
Salaries and expenses

For expenses necessary for the conduct of international labor affairs, \$1,204,000.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask a question or two concerning the subject of the Bureau of International Labor Affairs. How is this money expended? Is

this in connection with the International Labor Organization?

Mr. FOGARTY. It is. I might say to the gentleman, this appropriation carries fewer positions in 1966 than they had in 1965. This is one area where we have a reduction in the number of positions.

Mr. GROSS. This then is the money that is used to finance U.S. participation in the International Labor Organization?

Mr. FOGARTY. It does not finance the participation; no. But it backs up the international labor movement.

Mr. GROSS. Then there is money in another bill for that purpose?

Mr. FOGARTY. Yes, in the State Department.

Mr. GROSS. I see. A subcommittee of which I am a member held some hearings early this year or late last year in connection with the International Labor Organization and it appeared then that the U.S. representation was quite dissatisfied with what is happening in recent international conferences.

Mr. FOGARTY. That is in the State Department appropriation bill.

Mr. GROSS. I suppose the gentleman is acquainted with the dissatisfaction on the part of the American representatives in that they are having trouble with delegates of the Communist-dominated countries and with sympathizers of communism from other countries? I would hope that this committee would keep a close check with a view toward cutting this appropriation further if this situation continues to get worse.

While I have the floor, I would like to ask the gentleman a question concerning, I believe it is, the Office of Equal Opportunity and the medical examinations of the individuals applying for training under this new setup. Is there any money in this bill for these physical examinations or is that to be found in some other bill?

Mr. FOGARTY. No; you are talking about the Office of Economic Opportunity—the anti-poverty program?

Mr. GROSS. Yes.

Mr. FOGARTY. There is no money here for those purposes and we expect them to ask for any funds they need for personnel and any other services when they come before our committee in May—if the program is extended.

Mr. GROSS. I will say to the gentleman that I asked the question because I was amazed to learn the other day that where there is no veterans' facility or no USPHS facility to provide for Federal examination of applicants that local officials are authorized to pay as much as \$80 per person for examinations by private physicians.

Mr. FOGARTY. If they do that, it comes out of their appropriations and not out of this appropriation.

Mr. GROSS. But there is no money in this bill for that?

Mr. FOGARTY. No, there is no money in this bill for that purpose.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise

and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 7765) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I have permission to extend my own remarks and to include extraneous matter and tables.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

INTERNATIONAL COFFEE AGREEMENT

Mr. BOLLING, from the Committee on Rules (on behalf of Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts) reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 364, Rept. No. 283), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 701) to carry out the obligations of the United States under the International Coffee Agreement, 1962, signed at New York on September 28, 1962, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

### PROCUREMENT OF AIRCRAFT MISSILES AND NAVAL VESSELS

Mr. BOLLING, from the Committee on Rules (on behalf of Mr. COLMER) reported the following resolution (H. Res. 365, Rept. No. 284), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7657) to authorize appropriations during fiscal year 1966 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels, and research, development, test, and evaluation, for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed four hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

That after the passage of H.R. 7657, the Committee on Armed Services shall be discharged from the further consideration of the bill S. 800; that it shall then be in order in the House to move to strike out all after the enacting clause of said Senate bill and insert in lieu thereof the provisions contained in H.R. 7657 as passed.

### ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR MILITARY REQUIREMENTS IN VIETNAM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 157)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read, referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

I ask the Congress to appropriate at the earliest possible moment an additional \$700 million to meet mounting military requirements in Vietnam.

This is not a routine appropriation. For each Member of Congress who supports this request is also voting to persist in our effort to halt Communist aggression in South Vietnam. Each is saying that the Congress and the President stand united before the world in joint determination that the independence of South Vietnam shall be preserved and Communist attack will not succeed.

In fiscal year 1965 we will spend about \$1.5 billion to fulfill our commitments in southeast Asia. However, the pace of our activity is steadily rising. In December 1961, we had 3,164 men in South Vietnam. By the end of last week the number of our Armed Forces there had increased to over 35,000. At the request of the Government of South Vietnam in March, we sent marines to secure the key Danang-Phu Bai area; 2 days ago, we sent the 173d Airborne Brigade to the

important Bien Hoa-Vung Tau area. More than 400 Americans have given their lives in Vietnam.

In the past 2 years, our helicopter activity in South Vietnam has tripled—from 30,000 flying hours in the first quarter of 1963 to 90,000 flying hours in the first quarter of this year.

In February we flew 160 strike sorties against military targets in North Vietnam. In April, we flew over 1,500 strike sorties against such targets.

Prior to mid-February we flew no strike sorties inside South Vietnam. In March and April, we flew more than 3,200 sorties against military targets in hostile areas inside the country.

Just 2 days ago, we dispatched Gen. C. L. Milburn, Jr., Deputy Surgeon General of the Army, to assist U.S. representatives in Vietnam in formulating an expanded program of medical assistance for the people of South Vietnam. We are contemplating the expansion of existing programs under which mobile medical teams travel throughout the countryside providing on-the-spot medical facilities, treatment, and training in rural areas.

The additional funds I am requesting are needed to continue to provide our forces with the best and most modern supplies and equipment. They are needed to keep an abundant inventory of ammunition and other expendables. They are needed to build facilities to house and protect our men and supplies.

The entire \$700 million is for this fiscal year.

The Secretary of Defense will today support this request before the appropriate congressional committees.

Nor can I guarantee this will be the last request. If our need expands I will turn again to the Congress. For we will do whatever must be done to insure the safety of South Vietnam from aggression. This is the firm and irrevocable commitment of our people and Nation.

I have reviewed the situation in Vietnam many times with the Congress, the American people, and the world. South Vietnam has been attacked by North Vietnam. It has asked our help. We are giving that help because our commitments, our principles, and our national interest demand it.

This is not the same kind of aggression with which the world has been long familiar. Instead of the sweep of invading armies, there is the steady, deadly stream of men and supplies. Instead of open battle between major opposing forces, there is murder in the night, assassination, and terror. Instead of dramatic confrontation and sharp division between nationals of different lands, some citizens of South Vietnam have been recruited in the effort to conquer their own country.

All of this shrouds battle in confusion. But this is the face of war in the 1960's. This is the "war of liberation." Kept from direct attack by American power, unable to win a free election in any country, those who seek to expand communism by force now use subversion and terror. In this effort they often enlist nationals of the countries they wish to conquer. But it is not civil war. It is

sustained by power and resources from without. The very object of this tactic is to create the appearance of an internal revolt and to mask aggression. In this way, they hope to avoid confrontation with American resolution.

But we will not be fooled or deceived, in Vietnam or any place in the world where we have a commitment. This kind of war is war against the independence of nations. And we will meet it, as we have met other shifting dangers for more than a generation.

Our commitment to South Vietnam is nourished by a quarter century of history. It rests on solemn treaties, the demands of principle, and the necessities of American security.

A quarter century ago it became apparent that the United States stood between those who wished to dominate an entire continent and the peoples they sought to conquer.

It was our determined purpose to help protect the independence of the Asian peoples.

The consequence of our determination was a vast war which took the lives of hundreds of thousands of Americans. Surely this generation will not lightly yield to new aggressors what the last generation paid for in blood and towering sacrifice.

When the war was over, we supported the effort of Asian peoples to win their freedom from colonial rule. In the Philippines, Korea, Indonesia, and elsewhere we were on the side of national independence. For this was also consistent with our belief in the right of all people to shape their own destinies.

That principle soon received another test in the fire of war. And we fought in Korea, so that South Korea might remain free.

Now, in Vietnam, we pursue the same principle which has infused American action in the Far East for a quarter of a century.

There are those who ask why this responsibility should be ours. The answer is simple. There is no one else who can do the job. Our power is essential, in the final test, if the nations of Asia are to be secure from expanding communism. Thus, when India was attacked, it looked to us for help, and we gave it gladly. We believe that Asia should be directed by Asians. But that means each Asian people must have the right to find its own way, not that one group or nation should overrun all the others.

Make no mistake about it. The aim in Vietnam is not simply the conquest of the south, tragic as that would be. It is to show that American commitment is worthless. Once that is done, the gates are down and the road is open to expansion and endless conquest. That is why Communist China opposes discussions, even though such discussions are clearly in the interest of North Vietnam.

Moreover, we are directly committed to the defense of South Vietnam. In 1954 we signed the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty. That treaty committed us to act to meet aggression against South Vietnam. The U.S. Senate ratified that treaty and that obligation by a vote of 82 to 1.

Less than a year ago the Congress, by an almost unanimous vote, said that the United States was ready to take all necessary steps to meet its obligations under that treaty.

That resolution of the Congress expressed support for the policies of the administration to help the people of South Vietnam against attack—a policy established by two previous Presidents. Thus we cannot, and will not, withdraw or be defeated. The stakes are too high, the commitment too deep, the lessons of history too plain.

At every turning point in the last 30 years, there have been those who opposed a firm stand against aggression. They have always been wrong. And when we heeded their cries, when we gave in, the consequence has been more bloodshed and wider war.

We will not repeat that mistake. Nor will we heed those who urge us to use our great power in a reckless or casual manner. We have no desire to expand the conflict. We will do what must be done. And we will do only what must be done.

For, in the long run, there can be no military solution to the problems of Vietnam. We must find the path to peaceful settlement. Time and time again we have worked to open that path. We are still ready to talk, without conditions, to any government. We will go anywhere, discuss any subject, listen to any point of view in the interests of a peaceful solution.

I also deeply regret the necessity of bombing North Vietnam.

But we began those bombings only when patience had been transformed from a virtue into a blunder—the mistaken judgment of the attackers. Time and time again men, women, and children—Americans and Vietnamese—were bombed in their villages and homes while we did not reply.

There was the November 1 attack on the Bien Hoa airfield. There was the Christmas eve bombing of the Brinks Hotel in Saigon. There was the February 7 attack on the Pleiku base. In these attacks 15 Americans were killed and 245 were injured. And they are only a few examples of a steady campaign of terror and attack.

We then decided we could no longer stand by and see men and women murdered and crippled while the bases of the aggressors were immune from reply.

But we have no desire to destroy human life. Our attacks have all been aimed at strictly military targets—not hotels, and movie theaters and embassy buildings.

We destroy bridges, so it is harder to convey the instruments of war from north to south. We destroy radar stations to keep our planes from being shot down. We destroy military depots for the infiltration of men and arms to the south. We patrol routes of communications to halt the invaders. We destroy ammunition dumps to prevent the use of explosives against our men and our allies.

Who among us can feel confident that we should allow our soldiers to be killed, while the aggressor sits smiling and se-

cure in his sanctuary, protected by a border which he has violated a thousand times. I do not believe that is the view of the American people or of the Congress.

However, the bombing is not an end in itself. Its purpose is to bring us closer to the day of peace. And whenever it will serve the interests of peace to do so, we will end it.

And let us also remember, when we began the bombings there was little talk of negotiations. There were few worldwide cries for peace. Some who now speak most loudly were quietly content to permit Americans and Vietnamese to die and suffer at the hands of terror without protest. Our firmness may well have already brought us closer to peace.

Our conclusions are plain.

We will not surrender.

We do not wish to enlarge the conflict.

We desire peaceful settlement and talks.

And the aggression continues.

Therefore I see no choice but to continue the course we are on, filled as it is with peril and uncertainty.

I believe the American people support that course. They have learned the great lesson of this generation: Whenever we have stood firm aggression has been halted, peace restored, and liberty maintained.

This was true in Iran, in Greece and Turkey, and in Korea.

It was true in the Formosa Straits and in Lebanon.

It was true at the Cuban missile crisis.

It will be true again in southeast Asia.

Our people do not flinch from sacrifice or risk when the cause of freedom demands it. And they have the deep, abiding, true instinct of the American people. When our Nation is challenged it must respond. When freedom is in danger we must stand up to that danger. When we are attacked we must fight.

I know the Congress shares these beliefs of the people they represent.

I do not ask complete approval for every phrase and action of your Government. I do ask for prompt support of our basic course: Resistance to aggression, moderation in the use of power, and a constant search for peace. Nothing will do more to strengthen your country in the world than the proof of national unity which an overwhelming vote for this appropriation will clearly show. To deny and delay this means to deny and to delay the fullest support of the American people and the American Congress to those brave men who are risking their lives for freedom in Vietnam.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, May 4, 1965.

#### COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order tomorrow, or on a subsequent day this week, to consider a House joint resolution making a supplemental appropriation for the Department of Defense.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, it is my understand-

ing that the message from the President of the United States which has been just submitted will satisfy the Budget and Accounting Act as far as a budget estimate is concerned.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, that is certainly my opinion, and I am sure the gentleman is correct. This is a request for \$700 million by the President. It follows one of the procedures used by the Executive in submitting budget estimates and I consider this, and I am sure the gentleman does, a budget request from the President.

Mr. LAIRD. I would like to state to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] that it was my understanding yesterday that before we considered this we would have a budget estimate. I wholeheartedly support the principle of following the regular procedure in seeing that these funds are appropriated, and if this satisfies the Budget and Accounting Act, I certainly would have no objection to its being considered either tomorrow or the next day.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

#### PROPOSED LEGISLATION TO CONSTRUCT 17, 82-FOOT PATROL SHIPS

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill in the amount of \$6,260,000 to authorize the construction of 17, 82-foot patrol ships that have been withdrawn from duty on the Atlantic coast, the Pacific coast, and the gulf coast to be sent to Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold hearings on this bill Thursday of this week and we hope to report the bill out of the committee and ask for immediate consideration this week, if possible.

This is an urgent matter for it leaves assigned duty of the Coast Guard on the gulf, Atlantic, and Pacific coasts without sufficient patrol ships—these coasts that will be faced with the withdrawal of these ships and the sending of them to patrol duty in joint utilization with the Navy.

Mr. Speaker, I could read the stations from which these ships are taken, but I shall insert in the RECORD so the Members of the House will know how serious this matter is at the present time, and



it has been a serious matter for several years. On the New England coast, the Florida coast, the mid-Atlantic coast and the north Pacific coast the situation of the shortage of working materials for the Coast Guard has existed for the past many years where there are supposed to be or are said to be Russian trawlers off these coasts. The Navy has issued a statement recently and it has been in the paper to the effect that these ships are not fishing trawlers but are observation vessels watching the activity of the U.S. Navy in various areas around our continental waters.

Mr. Speaker, I include herein the stations to which I earlier referred:

#### DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

Construct 17 steel-hulled small patrol boats. These vessels to have a length of 83 feet 10 inches overall, diesel propulsion, maximum speed of 22 knots, cruising range at economical speed of over 800 miles, and all necessary electronics equipment for navigation and communications.

#### REASON FOR REQUEST AND RELATION TO LONG-RANGE PLANS OF COAST GUARD

These patrol boats are required to replace 17 similar boats deployed to Vietnam. To accomplish this deployment boats were taken from the following locations: Woods Hole, Mass.; Fire Island, N.Y.; Sandy Hook, N.J.; Cape May, N.J.; Norfolk, Va. (2); Fort Pierce, Fla.; Grand Isle, La.; Galveston, Tex.; Port Isabel, Tex.; Long Beach, Calif.; San Pedro, Calif.; Newport Beach, Calif.; Benicia, Calif.; San Francisco, Calif.; Everett, Wash.; Bellingham, Wash. This has resulted in a definite reduction of the Coast Guard search and rescue capability in these locations. With these replacements, the long-range plan for this type vessel operating off U.S. shores will be fulfilled.

#### NEED FOR ADDITIONAL PATROL VESSELS FOR THE U.S. COAST GUARD

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, I merely want to say that I join the chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER], in this matter and I too have introduced this authorization bill.

In addition to what our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from North Carolina, has said, I would like to point out we are now entering in the United States the peak of our recreational boating and the withdrawal of these seventeen 80- to 85-foot Coast Guard vessels is going to be a great blow to the preservation and the safety of the public. Certainly they ought to be replaced at the first possible moment.

#### COMMUNITY MENTAL HEALTH CENTERS ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1965

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules I call up

House Resolution 356 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### H. RES. 356

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2985) to authorize assistance in meeting the initial cost of professional and technical personnel for comprehensive community mental health centers. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed three hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider the substitute amendment recommended by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce now in the bill and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the five-minute rule as an original bill. At the conclusion of such consideration the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any member may demand a separate vote in the House on any of the amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or committee substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes of my time to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], and pending that I yield myself such time as I may use.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 356 provides for consideration of H.R. 2985, a bill to authorize assistance in meeting the initial cost of professional and technical personnel for comprehensive community mental health centers. The resolution provides an open rule with 3 hours of general debate, making it in order to consider the committee substitute as an original bill for the purpose of amendment.

H.R. 2985 would amend the Community Mental Health Centers Act to authorize financial assistance toward meeting the cost of technical and professional personnel serving in such centers during the first 51 months in which such centers, or new services in existing centers, are in operation. Such assistance is necessary to enable communities to establish or improve centers while completing arrangements for permanent sources of financial support.

The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare would be authorized to make grants not exceeding 75 percent of eligible staff costs in the first 15 months of operation, 60 percent in the first subsequent year, 45 percent in the second, and 30 percent in the third and final subsequent year. The bill only authorizes appropriations for 4 fiscal years.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 356.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN], explained this resolution or rule which makes in order the

consideration of H.R. 2985 under an open rule with 2 hours of general debate and under the 5-minute amendment rule.

The bill itself is an amendment to the Mental Health Center Act passed by the Congress last year. This measure provides that the authority be placed with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to make grants or gifts of some \$73,500,000 in total amount to the various local or regional health centers that are established throughout the country under the original act.

The funds would really be divided as far as the expenditure is concerned; \$19,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966; \$24 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967; and \$30 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968.

The funds involved would be used to start local or regional health centers—to staff them and obtain the expert and authoritative assistance needed to bring them into operation and help them on the way. Rather ingeniously, and I think very properly, the committee has provided that the percentage amounts of the grants to these health centers shall be reduced year by year, so that there will be every incentive to complete the staffing and establishment of operational facilities at the earliest possible date, while the Federal grants are available. This helps to insure that the facilities will be available for use as quickly as possible.

Now the bill itself has the unanimous support of all members of the great Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and was reported by a unanimous vote of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. Speaker, I know of no opposition to the rule on this side and have no further requests for time.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2985) to authorize assistance in meeting the initial cost of professional and technical personnel for comprehensive community mental health centers.

The motion was agreed to.

#### IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of H.R. 2985 with Mr. VANIK in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS] will be recognized for 1½ hours and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER] will be recognized for 1½ hours.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS].

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the bill before the House today will provide for the use of Federal funds to finance a portion of the costs of professional and technical personnel utilized to staff community mental health centers during the first 51 months in which such centers or new services in existing centers are in operation. The Federal share of the cost of these personnel is provided on a declining basis throughout this 51-month period and at the conclusion of the 51 months, no Federal funds will be available for the services at the centers covered. Grants under the legislation for the financing of these services thereafter will be the responsibility of the State or local community concerned.

Our committee held hearings on this legislation extending over 4 days, and considered it in executive session for 3 days, made a substantial number of amendments in the bill which strengthened and improved it, and ordered the bill reported to the House by a unanimous vote. The costs of the bill as authorized by the committee are set out in a table on page 3 of the committee report, and over the life of the bill will total \$173,025,000.

These amendments, however, will not be the total cost of the program, since it will be necessary for the administration to come back in 3 years and request an extension of the program, at which time we will review its operation and determine whether further changes are necessary in the program as a part of our reauthorization.

Members will recall that during the 88th Congress our committee considered the bill which became Public Law 88-164—the Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Mental Health Centers Construction Act of 1963. This bill, considered in the 88th Congress, consisted of four titles. Title I dealt with problems in the field of mental retardation; title III dealt with the training of personnel for the teaching of mentally retarded and other handicapped children; and title IV contained general provisions.

Title II of that bill, as initially proposed, was in two parts. The first part provided Federal matching grants allotted among the States according to a Hill-Burton type of formula to assist in meeting a portion of the costs of community mental health centers. The second part of that title which proved extremely controversial and ultimately was deleted from the legislation provided Federal assistance in the staffing of community mental health centers constructed with assistance under the legislation.

At the time we held our hearings during the 88th Congress, it was not completely clear that Federal assistance in meeting the initial costs of staffing community mental health centers was necessary in order to provide for the construction and operation of these centers. Public Law 88-164 was signed by the President in August 1963. Under that legislation the States are required to submit State plans for the construction

of community mental health centers and are required to establish programs very similar in overall structure and effect to the Hill-Burton hospital construction programs currently administered within the States.

The development and presentation of these plans and the approval thereof has necessarily taken some time. In fact, all the State plans have not as yet been filed with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. As of the date of our hearings, only two States had actually submitted a plan but 36 others have indicated that they intend to submit a State plan before June 30 of this year.

The response of many States and communities to the establishment of the construction program has indicated that there is a clear need for temporary Federal assistance to community mental health centers when they are initially established in order to provide for an orderly transition for the community toward meeting the costs of these centers. It has been estimated that the costs of staffing and operating a community mental health center serving an area of 100,000 population and providing comprehensive services will be approximately \$1,200,000 a year; of which \$960,000 will be the costs of staff with the other \$240,000 going to pay for utilities, custodial services, and the like. This is a substantial burden for a local community to meet all at once and, therefore, the purpose of this legislation is to provide temporary Federal financial assistance to ease the immediate burden. The Federal assistance is to be provided on a steadily declining basis with State and local funds being required to take up the slack. At the end of 51 months the Federal assistance will terminate and the responsibility for staffing will thereafter be borne by the State or community concerned.

The States currently show strong evidence of increasing their financial participation in community mental health centers. Twenty-one States now have community mental health service programs. The amount of money appropriated for community service by 19 of these States for fiscal 1965 was approximately \$57 million and the amounts that communities are expected to expend are approximately \$38 million. Thus, the total 1965 appropriations for community mental health service programs in 19 States are approximately \$100 million. The following States have adopted Community Mental Health Service Acts:

California, Colorado, Connecticut, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Michigan, Minnesota, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Oregon, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Utah, Vermont, Wisconsin, Wyoming.

Community interest in the establishment of programs of community mental health centers has increased greatly in recent years.

In fiscal years 1963 and 1964, a total of \$8.4 million in Federal matching funds was appropriated to assist States in the development of comprehensive plans for the provision of mental health services. While the final reports of those planning

efforts will not be ready before the end of this summer, we already know a great many of the planning results which those reports will document. More than 25,000 citizens have been actively participating in this planning program, and that fact alone tells us a great deal. The planning has been as much local and regional in nature as it has been a State function. Individual citizens in local communities have had the interest to work at this planning business. The enthusiasm for the sound establishment of community mental health services has never been higher, and it shows no signs of diminishing. Although the Federal funds which have been supporting this planning program will expire in June, many States have already indicated that they will continue the program entirely on their own resources.

As a result of these studies, and the increasing awareness in local communities for community mental health center programs, there are already 200 communities that have begun project planning applications for community mental health centers. In addition, there are today a number of community mental health centers in operation in the United States.

Our committee received testimony from three Governors, and testimony presented by a representative of a fourth, and by numerous other persons in support of this legislation. The only opposition expressed to the legislation by witnesses at the hearing was expressed by witnesses from the American Medical Association. However, the witnesses from the American Medical Association agreed that where needs cannot be met on the local or the county or State level, then the needs must be met on the Federal level—pages 227 and 228 of the hearings.

Mr. Chairman, I turn now to a more detailed explanation of the provisions of the bill. The bill adds five new sections to the Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Mental Health Centers Construction Act—sections 220 through 224.

Section 220 provides that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare may make grants to meet a portion of the costs of compensation of professional and technical personnel for the initial operation of new community mental health centers or of new services in existing community mental health centers. The grants would cover 75 percent of costs for the first 15 months; 60 percent of eligible costs for the next 12 months; 45 percent of the eligible costs for the next 12 months; 30 percent of the costs for the succeeding 12 months; and thereafter no Federal funds would be available for these costs.

This means that Federal assistance will be furnished on a declining basis for 51 months in the case of every center which receives a grant under the terms of the bill.

Subsection (c) of this section was added by the committee. It provides that in making these grants, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall take into account the relative needs of the several States for community mental health centers and programs, the

relative financial needs of the several States, and their populations.

Under the legislation as initially proposed by the administration, the determination of whether to make grants to a particular center was left to the discretion of the Secretary. Of course, if there is more money available than there are needs for it, then we can be sure that each center which applies and is otherwise eligible will receive assistance; however, it is possible that the needs may be greater than the authorized appropriations. In such a circumstance, it becomes necessary for some system to be devised for allocation of the funds. The committee therefore has adopted a modification of the usual formula grant approach and has provided that the Secretary shall take these factors into account in making grants to projects within the States. By this means we will be able to insure a fair distribution of the available funds, without tying the Secretary's hands unnecessarily when situations arise under which the needs in one State are great while at the same time another State may not have any projects in a position to be ready to utilize available funds.

Section 221 contained in the bill sets out the conditions under which grants may be made. Grants may be made only to public or nonprofit private agencies or organizations and may only be made to centers which provide services consisting of at least those essential elements of comprehensive services prescribed by the Secretary. The third condition is that either a grant must have been made to the center for construction under the legislation approved during the last Congress, or the type of service to be provided was not previously being provided by the center.

The committee added two additional requirements which must be met in order for grants to be made to a center. The first of these additional requirements is that the Secretary must determine that there is satisfactory assurance that grants will be so used as to supplement and to the extent practicable increase the level of non-Federal funds that would in the absence of Federal grants be made available for the program, and that Federal funds will in no event supplant State or local funds. This is the usual maintenance-of-effort type of amendment frequently added to Federal assistance programs.

The other requirement added by the committee is that the services to be provided by the center must be described in the State mental health plan submitted to the Public Health Service by the State mental health authority in accordance with title III of the Public Health Service Act. We anticipate that appropriate regulations will be adopted under this provision to assure that recommendations of the State Mental Health authority will be given due weight by both the local community and by the Federal Government in reviewing each project application.

Sections 222 and 223 of the bill authorize regulations and housekeeping matters, and section 224 authorizes appropriations for the 4 fiscal years 1966-69.

The committee expects to review the program again prior to its expiration. We have written this provision in such a fashion that the administration will be required to come back to obtain further authorizations to continue payments made on account of centers with respect to which grants have already been made for staffing under the bill.

Section 3 of the bill was also added by the committee upon the recommendations of the General Accounting Office, providing that recipients of grant assistance under the Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Mental Health Centers Construction Act will be required to keep records covering assistance furnished under the bill, and make those records available for audit by the General Accounting Office. Similar provisions have been added to a number of other laws in recent years. Members will note that this recordkeeping and audit authority is not limited to the new programs contained in this bill but cover all programs under the basic act.

Mr. Chairman, this is one of the more important pieces of legislation that will come before the House during this Congress. It is not as expensive as many and except for those who are familiar with the promise of the program, it does not have quite as much emotional appeal as some programs; however, I am convinced that it is one of the more important steps this Congress will take.

In recent years, we have all been troubled by the tremendous increase in crime; by the tremendous increase in juvenile delinquency; by problems involving the misuse and abuse of dangerous drugs and narcotics; by problems involving increased alcoholism; by our rising divorce rate; and by the increase in admissions to mental institutions. These problems are far-reaching and fundamental in our society, and reflect in large measure the inability of increasing number of our citizens to cope with the stresses of a society which, as it becomes more urbanized, becomes more complex. These problems which I have just discussed can appropriately be considered as the external signs of some increase in mental and emotional illness in America and of an increasing inability on the part of many of our citizens to deal with the problems which they face in their day-to-day lives.

The community mental health center programs will not, of course, make these problems go away overnight; however, if the program works out as we imagine it, a start will be made in assisting many of our citizens to deal with these problems that many of them, unfortunately, today find too much for them to handle. We envision the day when there will be throughout the United States community mental health centers whose services will be available to all citizens who require help with mental illness or emotional problems.

I do not think it can be denied that increased mental health will help solve in some degree current problems such as alcoholism and the like. For example, a recent study indicates that persons who are juvenile delinquents themselves tend to have children who also will be

juvenile delinquents; and therefore the problem of juvenile delinquency tends to be cumulative. Similarly, with other problems. Therefore, the enactment of this legislation both in the last Congress and in this Congress, providing for the establishment of community mental health centers, could well have the profoundest beneficial effects upon our society in the long run, of all legislation which will be considered during this Congress.

Mr. Chairman, our committee unanimously ordered this bill reported, and we recommend to the House that it be adopted.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, not too long ago, during the 88th Congress, I stood here to explain and support the bill which would provide funds for the construction of community mental health centers across the Nation. Our committee had given the matter long and careful consideration, listening to the foremost experts in the field of mental health. One thing, above all else, impressed us as we studied this vital matter. Mental health care must be brought back to the community and away from the warehouse kind of care which now, of necessity, prevails in most of our States.

We learned that by making available diagnostic services and early in and outpatient care for mental disorders at the community level the likelihood of successful recovery rises dramatically. Sending a patient to a large, remote hospital can be equivalent to throwing him over a cliff. Keeping him in the community, with familiar faces and places can and very likely will transform his illness into a minor and readily curable ailment.

The purpose of Public Law 88-164 was to carry out this philosophy and make it possible for most communities to create the facilities for mental care. It was a Hill-Burton bill for mental health.

At that time we considered the possibility of providing financial assistance for staffing these centers, but decided that it might not be necessary, and if not really necessary it was downright undesirable.

In the months that have passed since consideration of Public Law 88-164 the State and local governments have been carrying out the long-range and comparative planning function which has been ground into all programs of this type. They have been assessing the needs for mental health facilities on a detailed basis within their jurisdictions and even establishing priorities for projects. Along with this job of planning they have been counting their pennies—assessing the resources available at both State and local levels to do the complete job. They know that there is need for action in this field and that plans should include alternatives which depend upon varying factors. An addition to the local hospital is no good if it cannot be supported once it is in place. No amount of money can make it go if personnel to man it are totally unavailable. This planning and assessment function was contemplated

by the previous legislation, and based upon past experience with programs of this kind the various governmental units went at it with a will.

When we looked at H.R. 2985 the pattern of results from this planning effort seemed to indicate that something further was required. The States with excellent records of accomplishment in the mental health field, my own State of Illinois being one of those, came forward to report that staffing assistance would be necessary if the purposes of Public Law 88-164 were to be carried out. There was no reason to look upon this conclusion as a grab for Federal funds. These States had committed their resources to this effort long before the Federal Government gave any indication of assistance. They had, at least in part, furnished the experience upon which the soundness of the whole concept of treatment could stand.

I have been satisfied by the record presented by these progressive and responsible State governments that we should now proceed to make funds available for staffing assistance with some caveats and adequate safeguards.

Now that the planning has gone forward we know that the construction money is in great demand. Apparently every State can use its initial allocation. Now there is a sound basis for costing out the program as it applies to the individual community. Now we also know that the combined requirement for construction, staffing, and operating funds makes a big bite for many cities. I am sure that many ambitious plans for mental health centers have been reassessed and cut back to realistic levels consistent with the resources available now and in the future. Not every community is going to find it possible to pick up the tab for over \$1 million per year in operating expense for each 100,000 population. But with the boost supplied by this and the previous legislation they can and apparently are ready and willing to commit themselves to reasonable and meaningful programs to meet the mental health problem on their own frontiers.

Recognizing the sincerity, eagerness, and dedication of all echelons we must, however, also recognize potential problems.

The legislation, as originally proposed, would have made the allocation of the funds by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare a matter of considering and accepting projects as they came to him. This would put a premium on speed, rather than thoroughness and deliberate planning. It could well result in all of the staffing money going to a few States or even to a few cities which happen to be ready and funded. This would frustrate the overall intent of the program. The alternative of formula grants across the board was considered but not adopted by the committee. Rather, the committee provided that the Secretary shall take into account the relative need of the States for mental health centers, the financial need, and population. This is much in the manner of Hill-Burton, but it avoids the complication of having all the money spread out in places it might not be used

soon, if at all. It should expedite the opening of mental health centers in more places within the next 3 years.

Another problem recognized by the committee had to do with planning. Any community which has carefully thought out its program and is ready to create and maintain a community mental health center should be allowed to proceed. But pure town-to-town competition for funds could be disastrous to long-range health goals on a statewide basis. The State government should take an overall look at the needs for such facilities and the part it will play in meeting them. Therefore, the bill provides that the State mental health plan shall describe the services to be supported by the funds provided hereunder. This gives necessary guidance to the community in making its project and to the Federal Government in considering it for approval.

The Federal Government has had some experience in the administration of programs which provide funds for personnel and administrative costs. The earlier projects disclosed a great tendency on the part of State and local administrators to use this windfall of Federal funds to pay the people already aboard and to finance the services then being offered. Obviously, this frustrated the purposes of the Federal program. Unless we create new services and raise the entire level of effort by the State and by the community, we are wasting the resources provided by Congress. Certainly it is the intention of this legislation to assist in the creation of new community mental health centers and in the provision of new mental health services. As in other Federal programs such as the highway program, this principle undoubtedly works some injustice on local governments which have taken early action to attack the problem. We have already learned that it is impractical to create a Federal program which looks backward and tries to bail out ongoing programs. If the funds are used to support new projects and new services certainly every community will in the long run benefit. Certainly at the State level any support offered will relieve funds for other uses in the same area of activity. For these reasons the bill provides staffing assistance for community mental health centers constructed under Public Law 88-164 or for new services to be added to facilities in being. It is recognized that there is room for some interpretation as to what constitutes a community mental health center and also as to what constitutes new services. The report on this bill discusses and describes in some detail the services making up a program of comprehensive mental health care. Within these guidelines I feel that we have the basis for judicious use of the staffing funds.

Last year in the consideration and the debates on Public Law 88-164 it was pointed out that any staffing assistance was likely to become a permanent program. No doubt there have been already pressures for construction funds with no requirement for local participation. We have managed to stay well within the original philosophy of the Hill-Burton

Act in the matter of hospital construction. We must do the same with staffing. The record of hearings discloses the sincere belief of the Governors who appeared before us that the diminishing scale of assistance set forth in this bill will make it possible for the State governments to pick up the burden and thereafter successfully operate the institutions created hereunder. I cannot emphasize enough the necessity for impressing upon the States the need to look ahead to the day when the entire responsibility for the operation of the community mental health centers will be transferred to the local communities.

The cost of providing initial staffing assistance is not small. Exactly what it will cost cannot be accurately forecast at this time. Enough planning and preparation has taken place, however, to indicate that the projects ready for assistance over the next 3 years will require \$19½ million in 1966, \$24 million in 1967, and \$30 million in 1968. These, of course, are only the initial grants and once an institution qualifies for assistance it will continue to receive funds for a total of 4 years and 3 months. Each year then it will be necessary to fund the new starts and also the previously approved projects. This bill contemplates only the starts for the next 3 years. Assuming that the entire community mental health program works out as anticipated, there will be new projects after that time. The committee has authorized only the sums to finance the new starts for the next 3 fiscal years and the sustaining funds for those years and 1 additional year. The reason for following this procedure lies in the history of other health legislation favorably considered by this body. It was the feeling of the committee that the next Congress should have an opportunity to review this program. This can be done before the expiration of the authority of initial grants and in any event before expiration of the fourth year.

With the limitations and the safeguards which the committee has carefully considered and incorporated in this bill, I feel that we can safely proceed to provide the initial staffing assistance for community mental health centers. I am happy to have introduced this legislation and to have been one of its authors. I consider this to be one of the most important and far-reaching pieces of legislation to come before the Congress in 1965.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN].

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2985 and want to take this opportunity to commend the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and the other members of the committee for bringing this important bill to the floor. When the Community Mental Health Centers Act was before Congress in 1963, I urged that provision be made for staffing the centers. Unfortunately, staffing grants were deleted.

In the 88th Congress, I sponsored H.R. 9639 and in this Congress I have introduced H.R. 4545, to amend the Community Mental Health Centers Act to authorize appropriations for initial staffing

of community mental health centers. I am delighted that legislation is now before us to accomplish this purpose. It will also assist in the staffing of new services in existing community mental health centers.

The need for funds for staffing is critical. Two years of experience present compelling evidence of the need for Federal assistance for staffing, demonstrating that the deletion in 1963 was unwise.

According to Secretary Celebrezze of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in his testimony before the committee on this bill, there has been tremendous enthusiasm throughout the Nation for the establishment of community mental health services. The Secretary pointed out, however, that all of the States are heavily burdened by the cost of maintaining public institutions for the mentally ill and mentally retarded and that, while the States are also accepting the commitment to help support community mental health centers, many of them will not be able to take the first big step without this help. Applications for construction grants have been fewer than expected, a situation the Department attributes to the fact that staffing grants were not included in the original legislation. It now seems obvious that, if we are really to enter that "new era in the treatment of the mentally ill" which was envisioned in 1963, we must provide funds to staff the new mental health centers.

There is a great deal of convincing evidence that employing adequate numbers of trained professional personnel will result in a marked improvement in the rate of successful cures among the mentally ill. Statistics show a reduction in the number of resident patients in our State mental hospitals in recent years. We might ask what caused this decline. The answer may be found in increased State spending for drugs and personnel. The National Committee Against Mental Illness reports that in 1945 there was only one full-time employee for every 6.8 patients in State mental hospitals but that in 1963 the ratio had improved to one full-time employee for every 2.6 patients. In other words, the ratio of employees to patients has more than doubled despite a staggering increase in the total number of patients treated. According to the National Committee Against Mental Illness, this increase in personnel is unquestionably the most important factor in the very welcome increase in the net release rate of our public mental institutions.

Mr. Chairman, we will not realize the full value of the community centers we build if we fail to provide funds to staff them. As one expert in the field of mental health, Dr. George Preston, has said:

No building ever cured a patient. Patients can be cured only by trained people. They can be cured at home or in tents, or on farms, or crowded wards, if there are enough trained people to spend enough time with each patient.

Although we have heard a great deal in recent years about the shortage of doctors, nurses, and other professional man-

power, testimony before the committee indicates that there is adequate trained personnel to staff the community mental health centers. This is due in large part to the mental health traineeship program established by Congress in 1948. Under this program which is administered by the National Institute of Mental Health more than 30,000 stipends have been granted to physicians, nurses, psychologists, and social workers who wished to specialize in treating the mentally ill. Moreover, we expect the Health Professions Educational Assistance Act adopted by Congress in 1963 and the Nurse Training Act of 1964 to further increase the number of trained personnel ultimately available to the community mental health centers. The problem, then, is not insufficient manpower but insufficient funds to attract them to the community centers. The adoption of the bill before us today would go a long way toward solving this situation.

A number of witnesses before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, including Secretary Celebrezze and Dr. Robert H. Felix, the former Director of the National Institute of Mental Health, emphasized the urgency of the need for mental health centers with adequate staffs. According to their figures, the number of children with mental illnesses is increasing at a frightening rate. They cited a recent study which shows that there may be as many as 500,000 children with psychoses or borderline conditions. Another million suffer with various mental disorders, and at least 500 children commit suicide each year. As we know, there are very few clinics and residential schools which accept these children, and many of those are far beyond the financial reach of most families. If these children are to be saved from lifetimes in mental institutions, we must provide them with care now. The need is imperative.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to make one other point. It is this: If our community mental health centers are to achieve maximum effectiveness, they will have to offer truly comprehensive programs from emergency care to aftercare. And they will have to make full use of the special training and ability of various specialists. We must not fall into the habit of thinking that psychiatrists alone can treat the mentally ill. Other professional personnel, especially psychologists, have an important role to play. There is no question that the bill before us covers all appropriate "professional and technical" personnel needed to diagnose, treat, and rehabilitate the mentally ill. And the regulations of the National Institute of Mental Health should be drafted accordingly.

The Nation's mental health is vitally important. This bill, which is similar to my bill, H.R. 4545, is a significant step forward in this field. I urge its adoption.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I am proud to be a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Com-

merce. I think this is a most important piece of legislation, I support it, and I hope it will pass overwhelmingly, because I know what a tremendous help this will be to the various States of the Union.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

Mr. Chairman, I know of no opposition to this proposal. The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has meticulously and carefully worked out what we believe to be a most acceptable, desirable, and necessary program.

I want to compliment the members of the committee for the thorough work and understanding they have displayed in considering this legislation. I commend every Member on both sides of the aisle for the attention that has been given to this program, which I think is one of the most important I have ever seen in my service in the Congress. This program affects people who, too long, have been without the attention that they should receive. I refer to the mentally affected people in our country.

Some questions have been raised, and in many instances misunderstandings, in connection with this legislation. As an example, there have been some who raised the question that the psychologists were not treated as they should be in this program. That arises out of a misunderstanding.

Dr. Brayfield testified on behalf of the American Psychological Association, and I would like to read one sentence just in case someone may again raise the question that this particular profession was being discriminated against in this legislation. There has not been any discrimination against them.

He comments and I quote:

In this respect, we are pleased to see that the proposed amendment places no restrictions as to administration of these centers and it is not assumed that an M.D., must be placed in charge.

I think that this statement, which is a correct interpretation of the bill, should clarify any misunderstanding.

I think also it would probably be advisable for the information of the Members of the House and other interested persons to include in the RECORD at this point information as to staffing patterns of an average community mental health center. I will request when we get back in the House permission for this information to be placed at this point in the RECORD.

Staffing pattern of an average community mental health center

	Total number	Total cost
Psychiatrists.....	6	\$135,000
Psychologists.....	4	60,000
Social workers.....	6	60,000
Nurses.....	14	112,000
Psychiatric aids.....	24	120,000
Health educators.....	2	20,000
Occupational therapists.....	2	16,000
Total.....	58	523,000

NOTE.—In addition, approximately 14 supporting personnel including EEG technicians, laboratory technicians, X-ray technicians, dieticians, practical nurses, orderlies, at total cost of \$80,000.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Do I understand it is the purpose of this bill, after a 3-year period to turn these centers over to the States for their operation and that the Federal financing will end at that time and that they will be returned to local and State administration?

Mr. HARRIS. I will say to the gentleman that in general he is correct. For clarification I should point out that the localities and communities and States have charge of these programs. It is under their complete control and supervision. The Federal Government provides some assistance for 51 months. For 15 months, as I previously explained, 75 percent of the cost of personnel. The year following that, 60 percent. The year following that, 45 percent. And the final year, 30 percent.

Then the Federal Government phases out of it altogether. So the gentleman is correct to that extent.

Mr. GROSS. After 3 years and 15 months the Federal Government gets out of this?

Mr. HARRIS. After 4 years and 3 months.

Mr. GROSS. Then the Federal Government steps out of this program?

Mr. HARRIS. Yes, so far as the cost is concerned—yes.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, in 1963 Congress passed the Community Mental Health Centers Act. This was a constructive and imaginative approach to the problem of mental health in our Nation. Based on the growing evidence that many of our mentally ill could be treated with greatly improved prospects of early recovery in relatively small and flexible mental health centers near their homes, this bill authorized grants to the States for the construction of facilities for such centers.

Subsequent experience has shown that although this provided a good start, the problem is not solely one of bricks and mortar. A critical factor that has hampered most of the facilities initiated under this act has been the lack of initial funds for staffing of the centers. While it seems that permanent sources of funds to meet the cost of technical and professional personnel may be developed in the future, the lack of these funds at the crucial beginning period can spell the difference between providing the care needed at the earliest practicable date and the tragic consequences of delay.

The bill we have before us today, as reported by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, would amend the Community Mental Health Centers Act to authorize financial assistance toward meeting the cost of trained personnel in such centers during the first 51 months in which such centers, or new services in existing centers, are in operation.

While this bill works on the assumption that local funds will be available in the future, I think that such an assumption is experimental in nature. I do not think that in passing the bill we should consider that we are foreclosing the possibility of extending the assistance if this proves necessary.

I myself am very deeply convinced of the importance of this bill. Not only does the testimony given before the committee argue very strongly to this point but I have been in close contact recently with the National Institutes of Health regarding legislation I plan to introduce this week on narcotics addiction, and the authorities at these Institutes have stated repeatedly that one of the major problems with any program of this nature is that of staffing the facilities. I believe there is urgent need for this legislation and I urge your support of it.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation. As a member of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee during deliberations of the 1963 Community Mental Health Centers Act, I too have become increasingly concerned with the growing problems of mental health in the Nation.

This legislation fills a very critical need—that of staffing for community mental health centers. During 1963 the Congress recognized the merits of a new method of treatment for the mentally ill. Instead of removing patients from their environment, placing them in unfamiliar surroundings away from their relatives and friends, and compounding their maladies, noted psychiatric and social experts, and psychologists as well, urged the program of community treatment centers which was enacted.

The implementation of this program depends on the staffing of these facilities. It has become apparent that communities and local governmental units cannot immediately assume the total financial responsibilities of such centers during this transitional period. The temporary assistance to be furnished will make it possible to stem what has been estimated as an increase of over 100 percent in the number of mental cases in children between the ages of 10 and 14 during the period from 1960 to 1970. This fact becomes even more shocking when viewed within the context of an overall increase of 20 percent in the 10 to 14 age bracket during the same period.

Because 36 States have already indicated they would use the first year's construction funds for these centers, and because 200 communities in 48 States have started planning for community health centers, I ask the House to act with favor on this legislation which will make it possible to provide these centers with the trained professional and technical personnel so vitally needed.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Chairman, in the writing of this legislation, H.R. 2985, experience has proven to be a wise teacher. When the Community Health Centers Act was passed 2 years ago, it was limited to funds for construction. Funds were not provided for staff salaries. It was felt at that time that the Federal Government should get into the field of providing money for salaries of personnel in community-operated mental health centers, at least until experience with this new program had established a need so compelling as to override other objections.

Now, 2 years later, that need has been shown clearly. From the evidence presented to the Committee on Interstate

and Foreign Commerce, it is apparent that this legislation must be adopted if the program is to succeed.

One is particularly struck by the alarming increase in the rate of admission of children and young persons to State mental institutions. In fact, the committee reports that if present trends continue, there will be an increase, between 1960 and 1970, of more than 100 percent in the number of hospitalized young people from 10 to 14 years of age, although the increase of this age group in the general population will be only 20 percent.

Response to this frightening statistic is reflected in the actions now being taken throughout the country in nearly all the States to establish mental health centers. There are already 200 communities in 48 States that have begun planning project applications for community mental health centers. Many, however, report that it will be extremely difficult to start and develop these programs unless the Federal Government provides funds for initial staffing and operational expenses.

The States and communities simply are not able to develop financial resources swiftly enough to put this program into action in time to combat the tragically rising need.

This bill provides a good solution that has been endorsed in committee by members of both parties without dissent. It does not propose that the Federal Government take over the State's traditional functions but recognizes the necessity of helping them to get started and to operate during the crucial transitional period. Assistance, under this bill is to be provided on a declining basis for a period of 4 years and 3 months. Thereafter, the financing of the costs of staffing and operations will be the responsibility of the States and communities.

This is a sound approach, which is responsive to pressing needs. I endorse it enthusiastically and urge its passage by the House.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to speak in support of H.R. 2985. I do so with a deep conviction, based on events that have occurred since the day when the 88th Congress rejected a similar proposal.

The bill before us today is a proposed amendment to the Community Mental Health Centers Act of 1963. That statute, as we all know, authorized the appropriation of Federal funds to be granted the States in support of financing up to two-thirds of the cost of construction of community mental health centers.

In the months since the Community Mental Health Centers Act was adopted, we have heard from people in all parts of the country who are working to establish these centers.

It has become obvious that, helpful as Federal construction grants will be to many communities, that there are others—quite a large number, Mr. Chairman—that need new mental health services in the community more than they need new buildings.

The proposed amendment would make it possible for communities to secure these services, since the amendment pro-

vides for Federal aid to finance part of the cost of the initial staffing of new centers, or to finance additional staff for centers already in existence when they provide additional and augmented treatment services to the mentally ill.

As you know, I am the chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations of this House. We recently completed hearings on the proposed budget of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for fiscal year 1966. At that time, I asked the Director of the National Institute of Mental Health how much the community mental health centers program is going to be held up because of the lack of Federal assistance for staffing.

He told me that the smaller communities that will have worked for the next year or two to collect enough funds to match the Federal construction funds will be the ones to be hurt the most, since they will not have sufficient operating funds. And the regulations of the Community Mental Health Centers Act call for assurance of available operating funds before construction funds are awarded.

I should like to repeat here today my comments in the Appropriations Subcommittee. My mail shows that Congress made a mistake last year in not allowing funds for the staffing of these centers. I know we are at fault on that. All my mail shows that we should have provided these staffing funds. One of the main reasons why we have not had more progress in this field is because of the lack of staffing funds for these centers.

Since the time that I made that statement, Mr. Chairman, the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has conducted hearings on the amendment before us today, and the measure was reported out of committee with a unanimous "do-pass." I ask that the House follow the recommendation of the Interstate Committee and give the staffing proposal its approval.

Witness after witness has testified that the amendment will not bring about the need for permanent Federal financing in providing funds to hire staff personnel. As written, the amendment provides matching funds for this purpose on a declining scale each year for 4 years and 3 months.

With this aid, States, counties, municipalities and private agencies that sponsor a community mental health center will be given the breathing space they need to complete their own local financial arrangements on a permanent operative basis.

We must remember, Mr. Chairman, that States continue to appropriate tax funds to pay the load for patients in mental hospitals. And even though the number of patients in these hospitals has again decreased for the 9th consecutive year, it will be some time before enough community centers are in operation to cause a significant, further reduction in the hospital population.

During this period, the financial drain on States and counties to provide mental hospital services will continue, and many States just do not see a new source of

funds to add to community services and pay for the mental hospitals at the same time.

This amendment would allow the States to bring the new community-based system of treatment into operation, at which time the costs of hospitalization for mental patients will decrease more rapidly. And at the same time, local sources of financing can be assembled for the longterm operation of these centers.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, that the Congress now has an opportunity to rectify the mistake it made last year, and I ask that the House vote its approval.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time, and suggest that the Clerk read.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the Clerk will now read the substitute committee amendment printed in the reported bill as an original bill for the purpose of amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Community Mental Health Centers Act Amendments of 1965".*

SEC. 2. (a) The Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Mental Health Centers Construction Act is amended (1) by amending the heading of title II thereof to read "TITLE II—COMMUNITY MENTAL HEALTH CENTERS", (2) by inserting immediately below section 200 of such Act "PART A—GRANTS FOR CONSTRUCTION", (3) by striking out "this title" each place where it appears in sections 201 through 207 of such Act and inserting in lieu thereof "this part", and (4) by striking out "title II" each place where it appears in titles I and IV of such Act and inserting in lieu thereof "part A of title II".

(b) Such Act is further amended by adding at the end of title II the following new part:

"PART B—GRANTS FOR INITIAL COST OF PROFESSIONAL AND TECHNICAL PERSONNEL OF CENTERS

"AUTHORIZATION, DURATION, AND AMOUNTS OF GRANTS

"SEC. 220. (a) For the purpose of assisting in the establishment and initial operation of community mental health centers providing all or part of a comprehensive community mental health program, the Secretary may, in accordance with the provisions of this part, make grants to meet, for the temporary periods specified in this section, a portion of the costs (determined pursuant to regulations under section 223) of compensation of professional and technical personnel for the initial operation of new community mental health centers or of new services in community mental health centers.

"(b) Grants for such costs for any center under this part may be made only for the period beginning with the first day of the first month for which such a grant is made and ending with the close of four years and three months after such first day; and such grants with respect to any center may not exceed 75 per centum of such costs for the period ending with the close of the fifteenth month following such first day, 60 per centum of such costs for the first year thereafter, 45 per centum of such costs for the second year thereafter, and 30 per centum of such costs for the third year thereafter.

"(c) In making such grants, the Secretary shall take into account the relative needs of the several States for community mental health center programs, their relative financial needs, and their populations.

"APPLICATIONS AND CONDITIONS FOR APPROVAL

"SEC. 221. (a) Grants under this part with respect to any community mental health center may be made only upon application, and only if—

"(1) the applicant is a public or nonprofit private agency or organization which owns or operates the center;

"(2) the services to be provided by the center, alone or in conjunction with other facilities owned or operated by the applicant or affiliated or associated with the applicant, will be part of a program providing, principally for persons residing in a particular community or communities in or near which such center is situated, at least those essential elements of comprehensive mental health services which are prescribed by the Secretary;

"(3) (A) a grant was made under part A of this title to assist in financing the construction of the center or (B) the type of service to be provided as part of such program with the aid of a grant under this part was not previously being provided by the center with respect to which such application is made;

"(4) the Secretary determines that there is satisfactory assurance that Federal funds made available under this part for any period will be so used as to supplement and, to the extent practical, increase the level of State, local, and other non-Federal funds that would in the absence of such Federal funds be made available for the program described in paragraph (2) of this subsection, and will in no event supplant such State, local, and other non-Federal funds; and

"(5) the services to be provided by the center are described in the State mental health plan submitted to the Public Health Service by the State mental health authority in accordance with title III of the Public Health Service Act.

"(b) No grant may be made under this part after June 30, 1968, with respect to any community mental health center or with respect to any type of service provided by such a center unless a grant with respect thereto was made under this part prior to July 1, 1968.

#### "PAYMENTS

"SEC. 222. Payment of grants under this part may be made (after necessary adjustment on account of previously made overpayments or underpayments) in advance or by way of reimbursement, and on such terms and conditions and in such installments, as the Secretary may determine.

#### "REGULATIONS

"SEC. 223. The Secretary shall, after consultation with the National Advisory Mental Health Council (appointed pursuant to the Public Health Service Act), prescribe general regulations concerning eligibility of centers under this part, determination of eligible costs with respect to which grants may be made, and the terms and conditions (including those specified in section 221) for approving applications under this part.

#### "AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

"SEC. 224. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated \$19,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, \$24,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and \$30,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, to enable the Secretary to make initial grants to community mental health centers under the provisions of this part. For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and each of the two succeeding years, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to make grants to such centers which have previously received a grant under this part and are eligible for such a grant for the year for which sums are being appropriated under this sentence."

SEC. 3. Title IV of the Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Mental Health

Centers Construction Act is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following new section:

"RECORDS AND AUDIT

"SEC. 408. (a) Each recipient of assistance under this Act shall keep such records as the Secretary shall prescribe, including records which fully disclose the amount and disposition by such recipient of the proceeds of such assistance, the total cost of the project or undertaking in connection with which such assistance is given or used, and the amount of that portion of the cost of the project or undertaking supplied by other sources, and such other records as will facilitate an effective audit.

"(b) The Secretary and the Comptroller General of the United States, or any of their duly authorized representatives, shall have access for the purpose of audit and examination of any books, documents, papers, and records of the recipients that are pertinent to the assistance received under this Act."

Mr. HARRIS (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and be open for amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, during the past few years new ideas of psychiatric treatment have been developed. No part of the medical profession has shown more rapid increase of and application of knowledge concerning mental illnesses and their treatment.

Under the Community Mental Health Centers Act, many centers have been built throughout various States, but many remain without adequate staffing. Patients who in many areas were sent away to overcrowded, unsanitary, prison-like institutions are being treated quickly and at nearby centers and are being returned to their homes cured or improved in a matter of days. The total cost per patient will be less, for the treatment will be greatly shortened.

Mental illness is no respecter of bloodlines, age, or status. If it has not struck someone close to you, it may well do so at any time. Nothing is more heart-rending than to see a child, a friend, or a relative out of contact with reality groping with problems of the fantastic and unreal. Nothing is more satisfying than to see a mind regain itself under modern, effective treatment given by well-trained psychiatrists in a wholesome environment. It is expensive, but it is more expensive to allow those patients to be improperly treated or to be housed in a "snake pit." It is our duty, regardless of the cost, to care for our less fortunate brothers.

In our highly organized society with such an increased pace at which we live, we can expect more mental illness rather than less. Let us then not hesitate to vote for this bill which will provide ade-

quately trained personnel to care for our mentally ill.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. VANIK, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2985) to authorize assistance in meeting the initial cost of professional and technical personnel for comprehensive community mental health centers, pursuant to House Resolution 356, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed, and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—ayes 389, nays 0, not voting 44, as follows:

[Roll No. 90]

YEAS—389

- |                    |                |                 |
|--------------------|----------------|-----------------|
| Abbutt             | Brademas       | Corman          |
| Abernethy          | Bray           | Craley          |
| Adair              | Brock          | Cramer          |
| Addabbo            | Brooks         | Culver          |
| Albert             | Broomfield     | Cunningham      |
| Anderson, III.     | Brown, Calif.  | Curtin          |
| Anderson, Tenn.    | Brown, Ohio    | Daddario        |
| Andrews            | Broyhill, N.C. | Dague           |
| Andrews, George W. | Buchanan       | Davis, Ga.      |
| Andrews, Glenn     | Burke          | Davis, Wis.     |
| Andrews, N. Dak.   | Burleson       | Dawson          |
| Annunzio           | Burton, Calif. | de la Garza     |
| Arends             | Burton, Utah   | Delaney         |
| Ashbrook           | Byrne, Pa.     | Dent            |
| Ashley             | Byrnes, Wis.   | Denton          |
| Ashmore            | Cabell         | Derwinski       |
| Aspinall           | Callan         | Devine          |
| Ayres              | Callaway       | Diggs           |
| Baldwin            | Cameron        | Dingell         |
| Bandstra           | Carey          | Dole            |
| Baring             | Carter         | Donohue         |
| Barrett            | Casey          | Dorn            |
| Bates              | Cederberg      | Dow             |
| Battin             | Celler         | Dowdy           |
| Beckworth          | Chelf          | Downing         |
| Belcher            | Clancy         | Dulski          |
| Bell               | Clark          | Duncan, Oreg.   |
| Bennett            | Clausen        | Duncan, Tenn.   |
| Berry              | Don H.         | Dwyer           |
| Betts              | Clawson, Del   | Dyal            |
| Bingham            | Cleveland      | Edmondson       |
| Boggs              | Clevenger      | Edwards, Ala.   |
| Boland             | Cohelan        | Edwards, Calif. |
| Bolling            | Collier        | Ellsworth       |
| Bolton             | Colmer         | Erlenborn       |
| Bonner             | Conable        | Evans, Colo.    |
| Bow                | Conte          | Everett         |
|                    | Conyers        | Evins, Tenn.    |
|                    | Cooley         | Fallon          |
|                    | Corbett        | Farbstein       |

- |                 |                |                 |
|-----------------|----------------|-----------------|
| Farnsley        | Kluczynski     | Reinecke        |
| Farnum          | Kornegay       | Reuss           |
| Fascell         | Krebs          | Rhodes, Ariz.   |
| Feighan         | Kunkel         | Rhodes, Pa.     |
| Findley         | Laird          | Rivers, S.C.    |
| Fino            | Langen         | Roberts         |
| Fisher          | Latta          | Robison         |
| Flood           | Leggett        | Rogers, Colo.   |
| Flynt           | Lennon         | Rogers, Fla.    |
| Fogarty         | Lindsay        | Rogers, Tex.    |
| Ford, Gerald R. | Lipscomb       | Ronan           |
| Ford            | Long, La.      | Rooney, N.Y.    |
| William D. Ford | Long, Md.      | Rooney, Pa.     |
| Fountain        | Love           | Roosevelt       |
| Fraser          | McCarthy       | Rosenthal       |
| Frelinghuysen   | McClary        | Rostenkowski    |
| Friedel         | McCulloch      | Roudebush       |
| Fulton, Pa.     | McDade         | Roush           |
| Fulton, Tenn.   | McDowell       | Roybal          |
| Fuqua           | McEwen         | Rumsfeld        |
| Gallagher       | McFall         | Ryan            |
| Garmatz         | McGrath        | Satterfield     |
| Gathings        | McMillan       | St Germain      |
| Gettys          | McVicker       | St. Onge        |
| Gibbons         | Macdonald      | Saylor          |
| Gilbert         | Machen         | Scheuer         |
| Gilligan        | Mackay         | Schisler        |
| Gonzalez        | Mackle         | Schneebell      |
| Grabowski       | Madden         | Schweiker       |
| Gray            | Mahon          | Scott           |
| Green, Oreg.    | Mailliard      | Secret          |
| Green, Pa.      | Marsh          | Selden          |
| Greigg          | Martin, Ala.   | Shipley         |
| Grider          | Martin, Nebr.  | Shriver         |
| Griffin         | Matsunaga      | Sickles         |
| Gross           | Matthews       | Sikes           |
| Grover          | May            | Sisk            |
| Gubser          | Michel         | Skubitz         |
| Gurney          | Miller         | Slack           |
| Hagan, Ga.      | Mills          | Smith, Calif.   |
| Hagen, Calif.   | Minish         | Smith, Va.      |
| Haley           | Mink           | Springer        |
| Hall            | Minshall       | Stafford        |
| Halpern         | Mize           | Stalbaum        |
| Hamilton        | Moeller        | Stanton         |
| Hanley          | Monagan        | Stratton        |
| Hanna           | Moore          | Stubblefield    |
| Hansen, Idaho   | Moorhead       | Sullivan        |
| Hansen, Iowa    | Morgan         | Sweeney         |
| Hansen, Wash.   | Morse          | Talcott         |
| Hardy           | Morton         | Teague, Calif.  |
| Harris          | Mosher         | Teague, Tex.    |
| Harsha          | Moss           | Tenzer          |
| Harvey, Ind.    | Multer         | Thomas          |
| Harvey, Mich.   | Murphy, Ill.   | Thompson, La.   |
| Hathaway        | Murphy, N.Y.   | Thompson, N.J.  |
| Hawkins         | Natcher        | Thompson, Tex.  |
| Hebert          | Nedzi          | Todd            |
| Hechler         | Nelsen         | Trimble         |
| Helstoski       | Nix            | Tuck            |
| Henderson       | O'Brien        | Tunney          |
| Herlong         | O'Hara, Ill.   | Tupper          |
| Hicks           | O'Hara, Mich.  | Tuten           |
| Horton          | O'Konski       | Udall           |
| Hosmer          | Olsen, Mont.   | Ullman          |
| Howard          | Olsen, Minn.   | Utt             |
| Hull            | O'Neal, Ga.    | Van Deerlin     |
| Hungate         | O'Neill, Mass. | Vanik           |
| Huot            | Ottinger       | Vigorito        |
| Hutchinson      | Patman         | Vivian          |
| Ichord          | Patten         | Waggonner       |
| Irwin           | Pelly          | Walker, Miss.   |
| Jacobs          | Pepper         | Walker, N. Mex. |
| Jarman          | Perkins        | Walker          |
| Jennings        | Philbin        | Watts           |
| Joelson         | Pickle         | Wetner          |
| Johnson, Calif. | Pike           | Whalley         |
| Johnson, Okla.  | Pirnie         | White, Idaho    |
| Johnson, Pa.    | Poage          | White, Tex.     |
| Jonas           | Poff           | Whitener        |
| Jones, Ala.     | Pool           | Widnall         |
| Karsten         | Price          | Williams        |
| Karth           | Pucinski       | Wilson, Bob     |
| Kastenmeier     | Purcell        | Wilson,         |
| Kee             | Quile          | Charles H.      |
| Keith           | Quillen        | Wolf            |
| Kelly           | Race           | Wright          |
| Keogh           | Randall        | Wyatt           |
| King, Calif.    | Redlin         | Wyder           |
| King, N.Y.      | Reid, Ill.     | Yates           |
| King, Utah      | Reid, N.Y.     | Younger         |
| Kirwan          | Reifel         | Zablocki        |

NAYS—0  
NOT VOTING—44

- |               |               |                |
|---------------|---------------|----------------|
| Adams         | Griffiths     | Morris         |
| Blatnik       | Halleck       | Morrison       |
| Broyhill, Va. | Hays          | Murray         |
| Cahill        | Hollifield    | Passman        |
| Chamberlain   | Holland       | Powell         |
| Curtis        | Jones, Mo.    | Resnick        |
| Daniels       | Landrum       | Rivers, Alaska |
| Dickinson     | MacGregor     | Rodino         |
| Foley         | Martin, Mass. | Roncallo       |
| Gialmo        | Mathias       | Schmidhauser   |
| Goodell       | Meeds         | Senner         |



Smith, Iowa	Stephens	Whitten
Smith, N.Y.	Taylor	Willis
Staggers	Thomson, Wis.	Young
Steed	Toll	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

- Mr. Toll with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.
- Mr. Giaimo with Mr. Halleck.
- Mr. Rodino with Mr. Goodell.
- Mr. Hays with Mr. Broyhill of Virginia.
- Mr. Hollifield with Mr. Cahill.
- Mr. Morrison with Mr. Chamberlain.
- Mr. Powell with Mr. Thomson of Wisconsin.
- Mr. Rivers of Alaska with Mr. Smith of New York.
- Mr. Willis with Mr. MacGregor.
- Mr. Young with Mr. Mathias.
- Mr. Whitten with Mr. Curtis.
- Mr. Landrum with Mr. Dickenson.
- Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Foley.
- Mr. Daniels with Mr. Morris.
- Mr. Schmidhauser with Mr. Stephens.
- Mr. Staggers with Mr. Roncallo.
- Mr. Smith of Iowa with Mr. Holland.
- Mrs. Griffiths with Mr. Resnick.
- Mr. Passman with Mr. Senner.
- Mr. Steed with Mr. Murray.
- Mr. Taylor with Mr. Adams.
- Mr. Jones of Missouri with Mr. Meeds.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

**GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND**

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to extend their remarks in the Record on the bill, H.R. 2985.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

**LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM—SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL FOR DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE**

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to announce a change in the legislative program. Pursuant to the unanimous consent request obtained by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], the supplemental appropriation bill for the Department of Defense will be the first order of legislative business tomorrow.

**PLANS FOR DESEGREGATION BY DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE**

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I have seen the plans for desegregation which the

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is attempting to force on southern school administrators. Compliance with it would represent a surrender by local and State authorities to Washington dictatorship in the operation of the schools. This, I fear, is a preview of what is to be expected henceforth under the Federal aid to education program just passed by Congress. Most of our school officials feel they have no choice but to comply in order to obtain Federal funds necessary for the operation of their schools.

I wonder if money is everything. I wonder if our people back home are really prepared to surrender the control of their schools to Washington bureaucracy just to keep from raising the money at county and State level to provide for the schools. To yield now to the ultimatum from Washington will simply mean that henceforth Washington will control the schools of the Nation. That is just one step from curriculum control and thought control.

My recommendation to all schools would be to refuse to sign the abdication of their own responsibilities now demanded from them. Notably, only 1 Florida county in 53 has accepted the plan; 13 of 647 have been accepted nationwide. Assurances of compliance with the law have been made by most counties but they are reluctant to go the whole route and commit themselves in advance to any whim or fantasy on desegregation which may be generated by the U.S. Office of Education.

**AMERICAN ISRAEL PUBLIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE**

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include an address by Mr. Justice Goldberg.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, last night I had the pleasure of attending the sixth annual policy conference of the American Israel Public Affairs Committee. The Honorable Arthur J. Goldberg, Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, was the main speaker. Mr. Justice Goldberg's speech concerned Israel and the relationship of Americans to Israel. I believe that it was a most significant address which should be studied by all who are interested in the preservation and the progress of the democracy of Israel. Mr. Justice Goldberg's remarks follow:

ADDRESS BY ARTHUR J. GOLDBERG, ASSOCIATE JUSTICE, SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

I am glad to join in the 17th anniversary celebration of Israel's independence. Americans of whatever national origin, race, or religion have a deep and abiding interest in this young and vigorous democratic state.

The United States was the first country in the world to recognize Israel as an independent nation in 1948 and was its principal sponsor for admission to the United Nations. Presidents dating back to John Adams have shared the messianic expectation for the restoration of the people of Israel to the land of Israel. The Balfour Declaration was in con-

siderable degree the joint product of Lord Balfour for the British Government and President Wilson for the American Government. Congress in a series of bipartisan resolutions has repeatedly expressed sympathy and support for Israel; it has also generously aided and assisted Israel in its program of rebuilding and reconstruction.

Israel is a democratic nation sharing American ideals of freedom, liberty, equality, and social justice. Both America and Israel have a pioneering beginning and pursue common ideals with traditions of individual liberty that are in themselves the highest product of man's existence.

One of Israel's foremost leaders, the Honorable Abba Eban, has described Israel's Declaration of Independence in words descriptive of our own Declaration and Constitution: "Our Declaration of Independence," Mr. Eban said, "has its honored place amidst the documents of democratic history, for it inaugurated the life of a free, parliamentary society inspired by Hebrew prophetic tradition as well as by English common law and the robust egalitarian ideals of the American and French Revolutions."

In my service on the Supreme Court, I often have occasion to reflect upon the origins of the human rights which are proclaimed in the Constitution of the United States. It would forget the past to assume that they derive solely from British constitutional history—from Magna Carta or the English Bill of Rights or from John Locke's philosophy, although much is owed to English barons and philosophers alike. The roots of our contemporary conception of human rights reach much deeper in time and thought.

Many commentators have noted the historical connection between our modern views of the rights of man and older natural thinking which Western civilization derives from Graeco-Roman culture. But the sources of our Bill of Rights are more ancient even than the Greeks—they reach back to biblical times and to Judaic-Christian teachings and tradition. The Old and New Testament teach that all men have rights—because man is created in the image of God and is endowed with human dignity.

America and Israel share contemporary as well as traditional ideals. Both countries in the eloquent words of Franklin D. Roosevelt: "look forward to a world founded upon four essential human freedoms \* \* \* freedom of speech and expression \* \* \* freedom of every person to worship God in his own way \* \* \* freedom from want \* \* \* (and) \* \* \* freedom from fear." Both America and Israel in their foreign and domestic policies recognize that the four freedoms are more than challenging goals; they are essentials if civilization as we know it is to survive. Both countries, in the words of President Kennedy, stand willing to: "pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any foe to assure the survival and success of liberty."

Israel and the United States both profoundly believe and act on the principle that their true national interest is the attainment of individual freedom everywhere in the world—not only intellectually, so that any man may look any other man in the face and speak his piece, but economically, so that want and fear do not become the landlords of any man's private station in life. Both countries are committed to the view that a way of life that offers intellectual freedom through political guarantees, and also offers economic freedom through wise social and economic legislation is the highest creation of civilized man; that both bread and equality, both freedom and security are attainable and inseparable. The community of interest that binds these two free nations rests upon an identity of purpose—they share the vision of a better world

and a better life upon it—a world of universal freedom.

Israel seeks, as we do, peace in freedom. The leaders of Israel on every occasion have proclaimed their earnest desire to negotiate a just and lasting peace with their Arab neighbors and a willingness to cooperate with them in the development of the resources of the area for the benefit of all its inhabitants. The direct negotiation of an Arab-Israel permanent peace treaty to replace the present unsatisfactory armistice is a goal of American foreign policy just as it is the Israel goal. It is for this reason that no American need be restrained from reaffirming the traditional policy of the United States of support for the integrity of Israel and for its peaceful development—support which America, in equal measure, offers to every other country in the Middle East. It is also American policy to assist free nations resisting aggression. We have learned by bitter experience that the United States cannot stand idly by while the Soviet Union or Red China supplies modern and sophisticated weapons to countries practicing or threatening aggression against nations bound to us by ties of friendship and common purpose.

Neither America nor Israel welcomes an arms race in the Middle East. Both seek peace but the cause of peace, as Congress has recognized, will not be served by encouraging those preparing for aggression or by permitting those whose security is imperiled to be the victim of an imbalance of arms. All objective observers agree that Israel seeks in the words of Isaiah to dwell "in a peaceful habitation" and "in secure dwellings." Israel deplores, as we do, the wastefulness of armaments in a country and in an area which loudly calls for social and economic development.

President Johnson speaking of the tensions of the area simply but eloquently said: "Peace is first on our agenda" for the Middle East. Our country has the obligation and the commitment to keep it there and to pursue unceasingly the goal of peace in freedom for Israel and all other countries in the Middle East. And until this goal is achieved, we must reaffirm, give fresh vitality and practical implementation to the declaration of President Kennedy, renewed by the present administration, to intervene against aggression on the part of any nation in the area. Our firm resolution to keep the peace is in the best interests of the United States and the rest of the free world as well as the countries directly involved.

Without impugning the motives or good will of anyone, I must frankly state that I do not understand the reasoning of those who question the support which Americans and other free people, both Jewish and non-Jewish, extend to Israel and its people.

Sir Winston Churchill was a self-proclaimed Zionist because as a Christian he profoundly believed in the Messianic expectation. I am a Zionist because I share Sir Winston's belief in the truth of the Old Testament prophecy that God selected Eretz Israel to be His Holy Land and set it aside for the people of Israel.

And I am a Zionist also because I am loyal to the spiritual heritage of the Jewish people. This is a loyalty which in no way is incompatible with the undivided allegiance which I together with all Americans of Jewish origin and belief owe and freely extend to our beloved America—a nation blessed with liberty for all its inhabitants. One of the greatest Americans of all times, Mr. Justice Brandeis, said all that need and should be said on this subject in an address delivered just 50 years ago:

"Let no American imagine that Zionism is inconsistent with patriotism. Multiple loyalties are objectionable only if they are inconsistent. A man is a better citizen of the United States for being also a loyal citizen of his State, and of his city; for being

loyal to his family, and to his profession or trade; for being loyal to his college or his lodge. Every Irish American who contributed toward advancing home rule was a better man and a better American for the sacrifice he made. Every American Jew who aids in advancing the Jewish settlement in Palestine will likewise be a better man and a better American for doing so.

"There is no inconsistency between loyalty to America and loyalty to Jewry. The Jewish spirit, the product of our religion and experiences, is essentially modern and essentially American. Not since the destruction of the Temple have the Jews in spirit and in ideals been so fully in harmony with the noblest aspirations of the country in which they have lived."

I reaffirm now what Justice Brandeis said then, just as my distinguished predecessor, Mr. Justice Frankfurter, did during his lifetime. I am glad to take my stand along with them as a firm and committed friend and supporter of Israel and its people who are carrying forward the spiritual and ethical teachings of the prophets and the sages.

The interest that American Jews take in the welfare of Israel is legitimate and deep rooted. It reflects a brotherhood based upon a common past of triumph and tribulation and a common future of hope and aspiration for Jews in Israel and Jews in America. As loyal citizens of this great Republic, American Jews feel a common and uniting bond with their fellow Jews who have settled in the ancestral home. Accustomed as we are to breathe the free air of American life, we take pride that the air of Israel is also free. American Jews properly recognize that the continuity of their Jewish life which is important to our American pluralistic society is intertwined with the democratic and spiritual redevelopment of Israel. Because American Jews view Israel in the words of a distinguished Rabbi as "religion in action" they are proud to lend and urge support to this democratic State of Israel.

To me, like Justice Brandeis, the true test of an American is this: that he is one who does not conceal but affirms his origin, who is proud of whatever it may be, and who recognizes that in the plurality of American life is our strength and the source of the freedom that we so proudly profess in the world.

The genius of American life is that in this free and tolerant land there is room here for men of any race, religion and ancestry. Our strength is in this diversity of cultures and traditions freely honored and cherished—not in an enforced uniformity. The only uniformity or merger of identity which America has the right to and should expect of its citizens is that politically they are solely American citizens. There is no room at the polls for Protestant-Americans, Catholic-Americans or Jewish-Americans. But there is every need in our national life for the spiritual ideals of both the Old and New Testaments and every room for both the wearing of the shamrock on St. Patrick's Day and the celebration of Columbus Day; for both President Kennedy's and Senator JAVRS' sentimental journeys to their ancestral homes.

I conclude by asserting that there is every reason for Americans—Jewish and non-Jewish—to support that great adventure in human freedom, Israel, an adventure which parallels that great adventure in liberty, the United States of America.

#### SEA LIFT AND SENATOR MAGNUSON

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Speaker, at the recent christening of a new type of Navy ship, appropriately named the U.S.S. *Sea Lift*, the President of the United States made two most significant points: First, the importance of the Navy as a crucial part of the defense effort, and second, the continuing interest of both the President and the distinguished senior Senator from the State of Washington, the Honorable WARREN G. MAGNUSON, in maintaining a strong Navy as part of a strong defense system.

This vessel, of the "roll on—roll off" type, was built by Puget Sound Bridge & Drydock Co., of Seattle, Wash., and was christened by the Senator's lovely wife, Jermaine. In a telegram to Mr. James McCurdy, president of the shipbuilding firm, President Lyndon B. Johnson said:

I want to congratulate the company and the men who with their skills will have made this ship possible. She will join the fleet with the blessings of the most gracious of sponsors, my friend, Jermaine Magnuson. Senator MAGNUSON and I served together in the Navy, and on the Naval Affairs Committee in the House of Representatives during World War II. We are both aware of the importance more than ever today of new modern additions to the fleet to keep the Navy a strong arm of our national defense. This is why I, the President, have recommended a substantial naval shipbuilding program in the last and this year's defense budget. Sea lift is just as important as air lift in these times. This is one of the greatest ships of its kind ever built. My best wishes to you all.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

#### LINCOLN AND LEE

Mr. MACKAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACKAY. Mr. Speaker, we American people are indebted to the scholars who have recorded and evaluated the events which we call the Civil War period of American history.

Prof. Bell Irvin Wiley, professor of history at Emory University and member of the Civil War Centennial Commission, is a native southerner and a resident of the Fourth Congressional District of Georgia. No scholar has contributed more to the literature of Civil War history than this distinguished man.

On the occasion of the 100th anniversary of Lee's surrender at Appomattox Professor Wiley delivered an address at Emory University in which he assessed Lincoln and Lee. It merits reading by all Members of Congress and indeed all Americans who cherish our rich heritage and the legacy of these two remarkable Americans.

I include the speech, "Lincoln and Lee":

LINCOLN AND LEE

(Speech given by Prof. Bell Irvin Wiley at Emory University, Apr. 9, 1965)

One hundred years ago today Robert E. Lee surrendered the ragged remnants of one of the grandest military organizations of all

time, the Army of Northern Virginia, and by that act to all practical purposes brought an end to 4 years of bloody, terrible conflict. The American Civil War as many people have observed was the greatest tragedy in the history of our Nation.

Sometimes in the careers of nations, as in the lives of individuals, tragedy is a prolog to progress. This was true of the great tragedy of the Civil War. That conflict ended slavery. It decided that this land of ours would be one great nation rather than a loose aggregation of separate and competing entities each claiming to be sovereign. The "one nation, under God, indivisible" to which you and I pledge allegiance was forged on the battlefields of the great American conflict of a hundred years ago.

The Civil War also gave us our most cherished heroes, and the most outstanding of these were Lincoln and Lee. As far as I know, they never saw each other. How unfortunate. They would have gotten along well. There would have been mutual respect and esteem. I think it is not an exaggeration to state that Lincoln and Lee were the finest products of the Civil War. Each, during the tragic years that we are now commemorating, achieved outstanding and enduring fame.

Lee, the soldier, is recognized throughout the world as one of the greatest military strategists of all time. Lincoln, the statesman, enjoys even greater renown. On October 25, 1961, Carl Sandburg made a speech in the Library of Congress in which he stated, "One world figure came out of the Civil War. The name of Lincoln went around the world and is now a familiar and beloved name nearly everywhere \* \* \*. More books have been written about Lincoln than about any other character in history except Jesus Christ. Biographies of him are available in more foreign translations than any other character in American history."

Let us take a look at these two remarkable men. First, let us look at their contrasts. In background and early associations they were dissimilar. Lee was an aristocrat. His father was Henry Lee, "Light Horse Harry Lee," of Revolutionary fame, and Governor of Virginia, 1792-95. Henry Lee died when Lee was only 11 years of age. Indeed, Robert E. Lee did not see his father after he was 6 years old because Henry Lee went on a Government mission to Barbados and died on the return trip. Interestingly, he was buried on Cumberland Island in Georgia. Lee's mother was Mary Ann Carter, the daughter of Charles Carter, of Shirley Plantation on the James River. The oldtime Virginians referred to the "Cyatah" family on the "James" River. One could have no greater claim to social preeminence among early Virginians than to be a Carter. Robert grew up to be more of a Carter than a Lee. He spent a good deal of time with his cousins at Shirley. Outstanding traits of the Carter family were geniality, devotion to family, and loyalty to community. The Carters were traditionally religious, but none was fanatical. They mixed revealed religion and noblesse oblige in a delightful manner. Their code stressed economy, moderation, courtesy, gentility, honor, and devotion to duty.

Lincoln's parentage, on the other hand, was humble. It is a noteworthy fact that both his father, Thomas Lincoln, and his mother, Nancy Hanks, were Virginians; but like many of their contemporaries they had crossed the Appalachians in the great westward flow of humanity that came in the wake of the Revolution. Thomas Lincoln was not nearly as shiftless and no account as some of the biographers have represented him. He was a respected, honest, amiable man. He got along well with his neighbors, but he had difficulty staying put. He was a chronic mover. Nancy Hanks was probably illegitimate, but she was an honorable, admirable woman. Thomas Lincoln, Abe's

father, could not read, and it was with the greatest difficulty that he was able to write his name. Nancy Hanks could neither read nor write. When Lincoln was 7 years old, the family moved from Kentucky to Spencer County, Ind., then a vast wilderness, where they lived first in a partially open shelter and then in a crude log cabin. In the second year in Indiana, Nancy Hanks died of what was known as "milk fever," and about a year later Thomas Lincoln stirred himself to go back to Kentucky and persuade a widow, Sarah Bush Johnston, to come to Indiana with him as his wife. This was a very fortunate thing for Abraham Lincoln because Sarah was a dynamic and resourceful woman and a strong bond of affection developed between her and her lanky stepson. In his later years he often referred to Sarah as "my angel mother."

In schooling these men were markedly different. Lee was educated by private tutors and in Alexandria Academy near Washington. He excelled in Latin and in mathematics. When he was 18, he went to West Point. He graduated from the Military Academy in 1829, second in his class and with no demerits. (Charles Mason, later a distinguished lawyer in Iowa and Washington, D.C., was the top man in the class of 1829.) Lincoln's schooling was sparse and disjointed. He went to one-teacher country schools in Kentucky and Indiana, but in all his life he had less than a year of formal schooling. Yet his letters and his speeches reveal him to be a well-educated man. He educated himself by reading, studying, observing, and reflecting. Among the books that he read as a boy were "Robinson Crusoe," "Pilgrim's Progress," "Aesop's Fables," "Weems' Life of Washington," and Grimshaw's "History of the United States." He also pored over the "Revised Laws of Indiana," which shows how hard up he was for reading matter. But this ponderous volume contained such important documents as the Constitution of the United States, the Declaration of Independence, and the American Bill of Rights, all of which Lincoln virtually committed to memory. Another book that he read was the Bible.

In culture and demeanor these two men also stand in notable contrast. Lee was a model of propriety, as evidenced by the fact that he went through 4 years at West Point without getting a demerit, and demerits were very easy to acquire at that time because the rules of the Academy prohibited the possession in the cadets rooms of any cooking utensils, games, novels, romances, or plays. He was remarkably clean in his language and his habits. When Douglas Southall Freeman had completed the research for the monumental, four-volume biography, R. E. Lee, he made a speech before The Southern Society in New York City. In the course of his remarks he stated that in all of the research that he had done for the biography—an investigation extending to literally thousands of books, pamphlets, and manuscripts—he had never found indication of the use by Lee at any time in his life of a single profane or obscene word or phrase. There are not many high ranking military men in all of history about whom such a statement could be made. Indeed, why pick on the army? There have not been many men in any vocation or profession about whom such a statement could be made. Lee was a devout Episcopalian, and he attended church services whenever circumstances would permit.

Lee liked women, especially if they were pretty. He preferred the companionship of attractive women to that of men—which I think reflects favorably on his judgment. On December 7, 1862, he wrote his wife, Mary, "Thank Miss Norvell for her nice cake, but tell her I prefer kisses to cake." He was teasing, of course, because he was absolutely and completely faithful to his wife, Mary. The historical debunkers in their heyday were never able to dig up even a faint sug-

gestion of a scandal involving this truly remarkable man.

But Lee was no prig. Joseph E. Johnston, a classmate of Lee's at West Point, wrote in later years, "He was full of sympathy and kindness, genial, fond of gay conversation and even of fun \* \* \*. No other youth or man so united the qualities that win warm friendship and command high respect." Lee drank only moderately, and then strictly for his health. Some biographers claim that Lee never drank at all, but several years ago in reading the Lee family letters, then in the Library of Congress, I came across a note of General Lee to his wife, Mary, dated May 29, 1864, in which he stated: "I have not been very sick. \* \* \* Do not send any of the whiskey. Some kind gentleman has sent me some brandy which I am using." Now it is inconceivable that if Lee never drank whiskey he would tell Mrs. Lee not to send him any of that beverage. And in the Richmond City directory for 1869 I found this advertisement: "Steven Mason's—Gen. Robert E. Lee's brand of pure malted rye whiskey put up expressly for family use." Now since Lee was still alive at this time, it seems unlikely that the advertiser would have dared represent the brand thus without Lee's consent.

Lincoln was a product of the frontier. Apparently he never drank; but his language was sometimes unpolished, and he developed a fondness for off-color stories. After he got to the Presidency, he sometimes shocked people like Gideon Welles, who wore a funny little cap, had a beard, looked like a patriarch, and to whom Lincoln humorously referred as "Father Welles," with his frontier anecdotes. Sometimes he also annoyed Edwin Stanton and the Puritanic Salmon Chase with his raw humor. In his schoolboy copy-books appeared these verses:

"Abraham Lincoln, his hand and pen.  
He will be good, but God knows when.

"Hail Columbia, happy land.  
If she ain't broke, well I'll be damned.

Lincoln never joined the church, but he was deeply religious. His wartime letters and speeches indicate that in the toils, burdens, and the anxieties that he bore as President of a divided nation he experienced a genuine spiritual deepening. His wife, Mary Lincoln, said of him, "He never joined the church, but still he was a religious man. But it was a kind of poetry in his nature, and he never was a technical Christian."

In their relations with their associates there were also marked differences between these two men. Few men outside of Lee's family and close circle of friends ever were intimate with him. Dignity and abstinence tended to preclude intimate associations; but his was a benevolent nature and his generosity, his courteousness, and his graciousness commanded the respect and the admiration of all those who knew him. Lincoln was thoroughly approachable, easy, informal, genial, sympathetic. One of his greatest attributes as President was his ability to identify himself and the cause that he led with the interests and the aspirations of the great masses of the people, both at home and abroad. He instilled in the common folk a feeling of closeness to him. He never forgot that his own origins were lowly, and in his manner and outlook he always remained one with the people from whom he sprang. The common soldiers on the Union side in their letters frequently referred to him as "Uncle Abe," "Father Abraham," and "Old Abe." These were not terms of disparagement but rather of genuine affection born of a kinship of interests and ideals.

In their administrative methods the Virginian and the frontiersman were also very different. Lee was a model of orderliness and precision. Lincoln on the other hand was informal, easygoing, and unsystematic in his administrative procedures. His law

office in Springfield was a shambles; books were piled all around on the floor. His desk was stacked high with papers, a fact in which I find much personal comfort. In his office was one large bundle of papers, tied with a string, containing this notation: "If you can't find it anywhere else, look in here." I think Prof. David Donald goes a little too far when he characterizes Lincoln as "an amiable bungler," but there can be no doubt that the President's conduct of his office had a certain loose-jointed quality which violated the best principles of administration.

It is perhaps in their loyalties that these two men stand in greatest contrast. Lincoln, a product of the frontier, appreciated the benefits and blessings of the Union. He realized the need of national authority and national means for building roads, canals, railroads, opening up the West, and providing schools, homesteads, and protection from the Indians. Growing up in this atmosphere he developed a deep attachment and loyalty to the Nation.

Lee on the other hand was the product of a locality and an authority that was two and a half centuries older than the Union. His first loyalty was to Virginia. As the sectional crisis approached in 1860-61, he condemned the extremists who were threatening the permanency of the Union. But when the break came and he had to choose between Virginia and the Nation, he chose Virginia. Douglas S. Freeman says that this was the choice he was born to make. There can be no doubt of Lee's sincerity. As we ponder during the Civil War Centennial the events that led to secession and war, cognizance should be taken of the fact that a man as sincere, as admirable, as unselfish and as honorable as Lee could prefer the State—his State—over the Nation. It is not fair to judge Lee on the basis of our own 20th century ideas concerning the Union, for his ideas about the relative position of the Nation and the States—ideas deriving largely from his background, experiences, and associations—were quite different from those of present-day Americans, reared in an intellectual atmosphere vastly different from that of a hundred years ago.

Now, let us turn to the similarities of Lincoln and Lee, and these far outweigh the differences. They were very similar in goodness and in character. Lee had seven children—three sons and four daughters. The sons were Custis; William Henry Fitzhugh, known as "Rooney" to distinguish him from his cousin, Fitzhugh Lee; and Bob, the youngest. The four daughters were Mary, Agnes, Annie, and Mildred. Interestingly, none of these daughters married. Interesting, too, is the fact that Custis and Rooney both became major generals in the Confederate Army, as did their cousin, Fitzhugh. Lee's relations with his children were marked by much tenderness and affection. Before the war when the girls were little, Lee liked to come home in the afternoon, remove his military boots, take a comfortable position in a soft chair, put his feet on an ottoman, and have his young daughters tickle his feet while he told them stories. He was a gifted raconteur, and sometimes the little girls would become so absorbed in the story that they would forget to tickle. Then the father would look up and with a smile on his face say, "no tickle—no story"; whereupon, they would resume the tickling, and he would resume the story.

Lincoln had four children, all boys. Eddie, the eldest, born in 1844, died in 1850. When the war came, Robert was 18; Willie, 11; and Tad, 8. Lincoln was devoted to his boys. Once during the war when Tad and Willie were playing soldiers with a doll whom they named Jack, they decided that Jack had been guilty of the terrible offense of going to sleep on picket. They held a quick court-martial and sentenced him to be shot. They

were about to carry out the execution in their play when the White House gardener suggested that the President might pardon the offender. Lincoln fell in readily with the scheme and sent a note on White House stationery, stating: "The doll Jack is pardoned by order of the President, A. Lincoln."

Both Lincoln and Lee lost a child during the war. Agnes Lee died in 1862 at 23. Lee's letters reveal what a great tragedy this was in his life. Willie Lincoln died the same year. He was Lincoln's favorite son, the light of his life. Relationships between the two were very close. Just after the boy died, Lincoln came down the stairs in the White House to his secretary's office and chokingly said, "Well, Nicolay, my boy is gone—he is actually gone." Then the President burst into tears, went into his own office, shut the door, and remained for a while in seclusion.

Both men loved animals. During Lincoln's Presidency the White House was a menagerie of kittens, goats, and rabbits; and in the yard there were ponies. The family dog sometimes sat in the President's lap at mealtimes, and Lincoln fondled the animal while he ate. Lee loved cats. On June 29, 1861, after the Federals had driven the Lees from the family home at Arlington, Lee wrote his wife, "I saw a beautiful cat the other evening that reminded me of Tom. The latter no doubt lords it in a high manner over the British at Arlington. He will have some strange things to tell when you next see him." (An interesting characteristic of Lee was that he rarely referred to his opponents as the Federals or the Yankees. He called them "those people," but in this letter to Mary he characterizes them as "the British," which I suppose he meant to be a compliment.)

Both were good husbands. Lee was the soul of tenderness in dealing with his wife, Mary, who during the war and afterwards was severely afflicted with arthritis. He consulted her on all important decisions. He wrote her frequently even during the most strenuous campaigns of the war, and his letters fairly glowed with affection. On a dark November day in 1864 he wrote from camp near Petersburg to his youngest daughter, Mildred (he sometimes addressed her as "My dearest Life"), "Give a great deal of love to dear, dear Mother and kiss your sisters for me. Tell them they must keep well, not talk too much and go to bed early." Recall the circumstances: Mrs. Lee was ill; Lee himself was already showing indications of the heart malady that 5 years after the war was to take his life; his soldiers were ragged and hungry, deserting by the scores because of the troubled letters that they were receiving from their families telling them that they were suffering greatly at home. The mantle of defeat was settling over the beleaguered Confederacy. Yet in this dark situation Lee could write his daughters, "Keep well, don't talk too much, and go to bed early."

Lincoln's relations with his Mary were not always smooth. Mrs. Lincoln was nervous, high-strung, and she sometimes lashed out at him. The war was a difficult period in her life. But these outbursts were not always without provocation. Lincoln was absent-minded and careless about little things around the house. A product of the frontier he never became completely housebroken. One Sunday he was pulling his two little boys along in a wagon. His mind was absorbed in matters far, far removed. A neighbor came up to him and nudged him. Lincoln looked around, and one of the children had fallen out of the wagon. If Mrs. Lincoln happened to be looking out the window and observed this, we can understand that she might become a little upset. Despite the differences between Mary Todd and Abraham Lincoln, she made him an excellent wife. She came from a cultured background—she was of the Todd family of Lexington, Ky. Lincoln and his Mary complemented each other in a very

splendid way. She was able to polish some of the rough edges that remained from his frontier upbringing and prepare him for polite society. In dealing with this tense and anxious spouse, Lincoln was the soul of understanding, consideration, and respect. There can be no doubt that they had a very deep affection for each other and that theirs was a good marriage.

Lincoln and Lee were both generous and tolerant. They did not utterly condemn people who failed to come up to their own high standards and attainments. During the war a report came to General Lee that his good friend, a former Governor of Virginia, Gen. Henry A. Wise, had cursed an intruder out of camp. Lee called Wise to his tent and began to reprove him for this unseemly conduct and violation of army regulations. Wise, who was one of the very few men who dared speak his full mind to General Lee, interrupted and said, "General Lee \* \* \* your whole life is a constant reproach to me. Now I am perfectly willing that Jackson and yourself shall do the praying for the whole army \* \* \* but in heaven's name let me do the cussin' for one small brigade." Lee smiled and said, "General Wise, you are incorrigible," and let the matter drop.

Neither Lincoln nor Lee was the sort of person to harbor enmities. During the war one of Lincoln's young friends, J. Madison Cutts, became involved in a serious controversy. Lincoln wrote him: "Quarrel not at all. No man resolved to make the most of himself can spare time for personal contention." What better advice could be given a young man! In my younger days I was sometimes involved in quarrels. I can't think of anything that I ever gained by quarreling, and I do know that I lost much, of equanimity, of self-respect, and of the objectives for which I was contending. Lincoln himself followed the rule that he prescribed for J. Madison Cutts, and in not harboring enmities and in not fighting back at his critics is to be found one of his best claims to greatness. After the war a faculty member at Washington College (later Washington and Lee) spoke disparagingly of General Grant in the presence of Robert E. Lee, then president of the institution. Lee immediately said, "Sir, if you presume ever again to speak disrespectfully of General Grant in my presence, either you or I will sever his relations with this institution." And he meant it. Both were abundantly blessed with tact. Lee was able always to get along with the most rampant individuals nurtured by the plantation system, the hypersensitive prima donnas who held high place in the Confederacy, among them Jefferson Davis, Joseph E. Johnston, and Pierre Gustave Toutant Beauregard. Lee got along with the Confederate Cabinet. He got along with Congress. Lee "quarreled not at all."

Lincoln was able to get along with and use for the cause of the Union the talents of people who were personally distasteful to him—people who were opinionated and who thought that they were better qualified to head the Nation than he. One of these was William Seward, the Secretary of State, who on April 1, 1861, wrote Lincoln a letter which the late Prof. James G. Randall called "Seward's Fools' Day Aberration." In this letter Seward said in effect: "I know you are not very well qualified to run the country, Mr. President. I am a man of much experience. I am able and willing to bear this responsibility." Seward went on to suggest for himself something approximating the position of prime minister. But Lincoln overlooked Seward's incredible presumptiveness and kept him on in the Cabinet because he felt that he was the man best fitted for the position of Secretary of State. Lincoln got along with Chase. Chase was an opinionated, self-righteous man. He was exceedingly ambitious, and he worked behind Lincoln's back in a cunning, deceitful, unadmirable

way to try to obtain the Presidency. Lincoln thought Chase was the man best qualified to be Secretary of Treasury, and he put up with him, though watching him, until the summer of 1864 when he finally had to let him go. But instead of being vengeful or spiteful, he appointed Chase Chief Justice of the Supreme Court. Lincoln got along with Stanton who also was very difficult; but when Lincoln was forced to get rid of Simon Cameron, the Secretary of War, he felt that he should appoint as successor the person best qualified for the position; and on that basis he chose Stanton even though this man had once snubbed him in a law suit. Neither Lincoln nor Lee personalized opposition, a fatal mistake for anyone in high administrative position, because genius and ability sometimes come wrapped in strange packages.

Another similarity between these two men was their devotion to duty. Duty, particularly to the Union, was an obsession with Lincoln during his critical days in the White House. Many times late at night he walked the floor in his carpet slippers pondering the problems of the imperiled Nation. And he walked alone, bearing on his stooped shoulders the enormous burdens of the world's most difficult position.

Duty was the guiding rule of Lee's life. On one occasion he stated, "There is a true glory and a true honor, the glory of duty done and the honor of integrity of principle."

Both demonstrated exceptional capacity for growth, and this is one of the most critical factors in greatness. At the beginning of the war Lee had the reputation of being a model officer, but he had never led troops in combat. As a staff officer in the Mexican War he had acquitted himself gallantly, but he did not command troops. In peacetime, the largest unit that he had led was a regiment. In his first campaign of the Civil War, in western Virginia, he made a poor showing; and his direction of the Seven Days Battle, when he was first in command of the Army of Northern Virginia, left much to be desired. But Lee grew rapidly as an army commander, and he profited enormously by his mistakes. By the end of 1862 he had established a solid reputation, and before the end came at Appomattox he had made a record that places him among first ranks of great military leaders of all time.

Lincoln was hardly more than an ordinary politician at the beginning of the war, but under the trials and responsibilities of the Presidency he grew tremendously. And in the face of enormous obstacles he achieved a stature that is so awesome that many people regard him as the greatest of all Americans.

Finally they were both leaders of enduring influence. Lincoln's reputation increases with the passing of time. Throughout the world today he stands as the personification of American democratic idealism and a symbol of hope for the oppressed, even behind the Iron Curtain. Lee's finest hour came after Appomattox. To General Beauregard he wrote late in 1865: "I am glad to see no indication in your letter of an intention to leave the country. I think the South requires the aid of her sons now more than at any period of her history. I have no thought of abandoning her unless compelled to do so." To Gen. Jubal Early and other comrades who fled the country to escape Yankee rule he wrote in effect: "Come back to the South. Here is where you are needed. Use your labor and your influence to make of your native region a happy and a prosperous land." Lee set an example for those to whom he gave this advice. With considerable hesitation, deriving from his modesty, he accepted the presidency of a struggling little college at Lexington, Va., at a salary of \$1,500 a year; and he devoted his remaining 5 years to the task of preparing young Virginians to get a new start. Lee, the

champion of the Old South, became the first citizen of the New South; and Lee, the Virginian, became Lee, the American.

I am often asked the question, especially when I point out the shortcomings of Jefferson Davis as Confederate President, who would have made a better President? Invariably, and without any equivocation, I state "Robert E. Lee," because there was no man in high position, either in the military or in civilian life, who demonstrated as much of true greatness or statesmanship as did Robert E. Lee. It was a good thing for the future of this Nation that Lee was not the chief executive of the Confederate States of America, and it was fortunate for the Union that it had as its chief a man with the personality, the vision, and the greatness of Abraham Lincoln—a peoples' President in a peoples' war. Lincoln and the people, bound to each other by mutual ties of affection and respect, were an unbeatable combination. Now, 100 years after America's greatest crisis, as we observe the centennial of Appomattox, it is fitting that northerners and southerners should unite, as we do here at Emory University tonight, in paying tribute to these great men, and that we honor them as Americans each richly endowed with the qualities that have brought enduring greatness to the land of the free and the home of the brave.

#### SEIZURE OF FIRST-CLASS MAIL

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, today, I have introduced a bill, the objective of which is to end the invidious practice of seizing first-class mail under an "arrangement" that has existed between the Post Office and Treasury Departments since 1962.

My colleagues will recall that I first disclosed this violation of the privacy of first-class mail on the floor of the House on April 5, 1965, and at that time offered an amendment to the pending appropriation bill, which would have limited use of funds for such seizures, for a 1-year period. Unfortunately only a few Members were on the floor at that time and the amendment was rejected because many of those present were unwilling to believe that such seizures were taking place and lack of due process. Subsequently, the charges I made on the floor were fully confirmed when the other body's Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure, reopened its hearings as a result of these disclosures.

Replying to my charge, the Chief Postal Inspector admitted that there were improprieties, but officials, nevertheless, maintained that they had authority to seize undelivered mail, under the Internal Revenue Code.

I do not agree that any such authority exists, especially when it is specifically prohibited by the Postal Code, and by the protection of the 4th amendment. However, since two Cabinet officers continue to insist that they have the authority to do so, and since this alleged authority has never been tested in the courts, I am submitting a bill to specifically add mail to those items listed in

title 26, United States Code, section 6334(a), as excluded from tax levies.

I hope other members of the House will join in this effort, and that the House will soon have an opportunity to insure the true and sanctified privacy of first-class mail.

#### PREMIER ALDO MORO—COURAGEOUS STATESMAN

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, April 20, I had the pleasure of meeting at the White House with Premier Aldo Moro of Italy. On this occasion, President Johnson paid tribute to the head of the Italian Government in recognition of his support of American foreign policy in Vietnam.

Aldo Moro is 48 years old, a relatively young man to be holding such a responsible position in his country. He is a humble man, yet he possesses the rare qualities that are found in all great statesmen. In Italy, Premier Moro faces, day in and day out, the ruthless pressures exerted by the most powerful Communist minority in Europe. His political career hangs always in the balance. It would be the easier course to give into these pressures. Yet, again and again, he has stood his ground courageously and remained true to his ideals. He has demonstrated to the world how a man in public office, entrusted with grave responsibilities, should discharge his duties, with strength, bravery, manliness and self-respect. Indeed, he has set an example for all to emulate.

It is my pleasure to insert into the RECORD an article about Premier Moro that appeared in the Chicago Daily News written by the columnist William S. White. The article follows:

#### ITALY'S PREMIER—A MAN OF STAMINA

(By William S. White)

WASHINGTON.—Premier Aldo Moro of Italy leaves three things behind in the afterglow of his mutually warm—and mutually adult—conversations with President Johnson.

He has given to the timorous in this and other countries—men who would respond with elegant wordy words to the steel of a Communist invading force which has open contempt for any kind of "negotiation" until it has finished swallowing up South Vietnam—an exhibition of strength and courage.

He has given to many Americans and to others abroad—to men who gamble with the very security of the free world, sometimes out of mere petty piques at a strong American Government—a lesson in how grown men in high responsibility should behave in a world of danger and duty.

He has given to all an example of simple manliness and of a perfectly self-respecting but decent gratitude toward an ally—the United States of America—which for so little thanks generally has done so much for his country and so many others.

When one wearies of seeing the United States kicked by some of its allies for carrying a free-world load it never sought but

which elementary honor and obligation compel it to carry, it will be heartening to look back upon the visit here of Aldo Moro of Italy.

For he came not to carp at the leadership—this leadership which no other nation is able or willing to assume—but only to ask for more of it.

He came—this Aldo Moro, who in his own country faces day and night the most powerful Communist minority in all Europe—not to hedge before the demands of Communists, in Asia or elsewhere. He came to stand up against them abroad, as so bravely he has stood up against them in Italy, for the values of Western society and for the ultimate safety of world order.

If any politician on earth could find an easy excuse to trim toward the Communists, it would surely be this tired, dauntless Italian. But far from doing this, in Washington he stood like a Gibraltar with our Government in Vietnam.

He is a curious man, this Moro. For in his old-fashioned way he does not understand why some politicians here, to whom "communism" is only a word, are too frightened to deal realistically in Asia with a naked Communist aggression which they are so tirelessly excusing. To excuse it, they appeal to the last refuge of the appeaser—the claim that he alone values peace. But Moro appeals to the terrible realities of history in rejecting soft surrender; under some other name it is still not a rose but only a thorn of blood.

The word "negotiation" he never mentioned without qualifying it with the profound and powerful word "honorable." In his simplicity, he believes only in honorable negotiations. He believes also that no cease-fire should be left for its enforcement solely to the promises of aggressors who broke every previous promise in southeast Asia, not 10 but a hundred times.

So he gave no comfort to those here and abroad who argue the singular theory that the United States is at fault for an "escalation" of a war it never started, because it will not stop bombing aggressors who say flatly and in advance that they will not stop aggressing in South Vietnam. He cannot see how a halt to American defensive action, in the absence of even any interruption of Communist attacks, could serve any cause except the cause of more aggression.

Even at the risk of being called a "warmonger" in a leftist-plagued Italian coalition where his own political life hangs endlessly in the balance, he does not believe that to dishonor the solemn defensive commitments of three successive American Presidents would be either an act of statesmanship or an act becoming to men who have the hard duty to be men.

An odd fellow altogether, this Signor Moro, is he not?

#### ISRAEL INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter on Israel's Independence Day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, May 7 marks the 17th anniversary of the independence of that little but great bastion of democracy in the Middle East, the State of Israel.

Proper observance of the anniversary is being taken all this week throughout our country and the free world.

Last night it was my privilege to attend the dinner which concluded the conference in Washington of the American-Israel Public Affairs Committee. We heard a splendid address by Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, the Honorable Arthur J. Goldberg. I know of no better way of taking note of Israel's independence anniversary than to share with our colleagues Justice Goldberg's very fine remarks which follow:

ADDRESS BY ARTHUR J. GOLDBERG, ASSOCIATE JUSTICE, SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES AT A DINNER SPONSORED BY THE AMERICAN ISRAEL PUBLIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE, INTERNATIONAL INN, WASHINGTON, D.C.

I am glad to join in the 17th anniversary celebration of Israel's independence. Americans of whatever national origin, race or religion have a deep and abiding interest in this young and vigorous democratic state.

The United States was the first country in the world to recognize Israel as an independent nation in 1948 and was its principal sponsor for admission to the United Nations. Presidents dating back to John Adams have shared the messianic expectation for the restoration of the people of Israel to the land of Israel. The Balfour Declaration was in considerable degree the joint product of Lord Balfour for the British Government and President Wilson for the American Government. Congress in a series of bipartisan resolutions has repeatedly expressed sympathy and support for Israel; it has also generously aided and assisted Israel in its program of rebuilding and reconstruction.

Israel is a democratic nation sharing American ideals of freedom, liberty, equality and social justice. Both America and Israel have a pioneering beginning and pursue common ideals with traditions of individual liberty that are in themselves the highest product of man's existence.

One of Israel's foremost leaders, the Honorable Abba Eban, has described Israel's Declaration of Independence in words descriptive of our own Declaration and Constitution: "Our Declaration of Independence" Mr. Eban said, "has its honored place amidst the documents of democratic history, for it inaugurated the life of a free, parliamentary society inspired by Hebrew prophetic tradition as well as by English common law and the robust egalitarian ideals of the American and French revolution."

In my service on the Supreme Court, I often have occasion to reflect upon the origins of the human rights which are proclaimed in the Constitution of the United States. It would forget the past to assume that they derive solely from British constitutional history—from Magna Carta or the English Bill of Rights or from John Locke's philosophy, although much is owed to English barons and philosophers alike. The roots of our contemporary conception of human rights reach much deeper in time and thought.

Many commentators have noted the historical connection between our modern views of the rights of man and older natural thinking which Western civilization derives from Graeco-Roman culture. But the sources of our Bill of Rights are more ancient even than the Greeks—they reach back to Biblical times and to Judaic-Christian teachings and tradition. The Old and New Testament teach that all men have rights—because man is created in the image of God and is endowed with human dignity.

America and Israel share contemporary as well as traditional ideals. Both countries in the eloquent words of Franklin D. Roosevelt: "look forward to a world founded upon four essential human freedoms, freedom of speech

and expression, freedom of every person to worship God in his own way, freedom from want [and] freedom from fear." Both America and Israel in their foreign and domestic policies recognize that the four freedoms are more than challenging goals; they are essentials if civilization as we know it is to survive. Both countries, in the words of President Kennedy, stand willing to: "pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any foe to assure the survival and success of liberty."

Israel and the United States both profoundly believe and act on the principle that their true national interest is the attainment of individual freedom everywhere in the world—not only intellectually, so that any man may look any other man in the face and speak his piece, but economically, so that want and fear do not become the landlords of any man's private station in life. Both countries are committed to the view that a way of life that offers intellectual freedom through political guarantees, and also offers economic freedom through wise social and economic legislation is the highest creation of civilized man; that both bread and equality, both freedom and security are attainable and inseparable. The community of interest that binds these two free nations rests upon an identity of purpose—they share the vision of a better world and a better life upon it—a world of universal freedom.

Israel seeks, as we do, peace in freedom. The leaders of Israel on every occasion have proclaimed their earnest desire to negotiate a just and lasting peace with their Arab neighbors and a willingness to cooperate with them in the development of the resources of the area for the benefit of all its inhabitants. The direct negotiation of an Arab-Israel permanent peace treaty to replace the present unsatisfactory armistice is a goal of American foreign policy just as it is the Israeli goal. It is for this reason that no American need be restrained from reaffirming the traditional policy of the United States of support for the integrity of Israel and for its peaceful development—support which America, in equal measure, offers to every other country in the middle east. It is also American policy to assist free nations resisting aggression. We have learned by bitter experience that the United States cannot stand idly by while the Soviet Union or Red China supplies modern and sophisticated weapons to countries practicing or threatening aggression against nations bound to us by ties of friendship and common purpose.

Neither America nor Israel welcomes an arms race in the Middle East. Both seek peace but the cause of peace, as Congress has recognized, will not be served by encouraging those preparing for aggression or by permitting those whose security is imperiled to be the victim of an imbalance of arms. All objective observers agree that Israel seeks in the words of Isaiah to dwell "in a peaceful habitation" and "in secure dwellings." Israel deplores, as we do, the wastefulness of armaments in a country and in an area which loudly calls for social and economic development.

President Johnson speaking of the tensions of the area simply but eloquently said: "peace is first on our agenda" for the Middle East. Our country has the obligation and the commitment to keep it there and to pursue unceasingly the goal of peace in freedom for Israel and all other countries in the Middle East. And until this goal is achieved, we must reaffirm, give fresh vitality and practical implementation to the declaration of President Kennedy, renewed by the present administration, to intervene against aggression on the part of any nation in the area. Our firm resolution to keep the peace is in the best interests of the United States and the rest of the free world as well as the countries directly involved.

Without impugning the motives or good will of anyone, I must frankly state that I do not understand the reasoning of those who question the support which Americans and other free people, both Jewish and non-Jewish, extend to Israel and its people.

Sir Winston Churchill was a self-proclaimed Zionist because as a Christian he profoundly believed in the Messianic expectation. I am a Zionist because I share Sir Winston's belief in the truth of the Old Testament prophecy that God selected Eretz Israel to be His Holy Land and set it aside for the people of Israel.

And I am a Zionist also because I am loyal to the spiritual heritage of the Jewish people. This is a loyalty which in no way is incompatible with the undivided allegiance which I together with all Americans of Jewish origin and belief owe and freely extend to our beloved America—a nation blessed with liberty for all its inhabitants. One of the greatest Americans of all times, Mr. Justice Brandeis, said all that need and should be said on this subject in an address delivered just 50 years ago:

"Let no American imagine that Zionism is inconsistent with Patriotism. Multiple loyalties are objectionable only if they are inconsistent. A man is a better citizen of the United States for being also a loyal citizen of his State, and of his city; for being loyal to his family, and to his profession or trade; for being loyal to his college or his lodge. Every Irish American who contributed toward advancing home rule was a better man and a better American for the sacrifice he made. Every American Jew who aids in advancing the Jewish settlement in Palestine will likewise be a better man and a better American for doing so.

"There is no inconsistency between loyalty to America and loyalty to Jewry. The Jewish spirit, the product of our religion and experiences, is essentially modern and essentially American. Not since the destruction of the Temple have the Jews in spirit and in ideals been so fully in harmony with the noblest aspirations of the country in which they have lived."

I reaffirm now what Justice Brandeis said then, just as my distinguished predecessor, Mr. Justice Frankfurter, did during his lifetime. I am glad to take my stand along with them as a firm and committed friend and supporter of Israel and its people who are carrying forward the spiritual and ethical teachings of the prophets and the sages.

The interest that American Jews take in the welfare of Israel is legitimate and deep rooted. It reflects a brotherhood based upon a common past of triumph and tribulation and a common future of hope and aspiration for Jews in Israel and Jews in America. As loyal citizens of this great Republic, American Jews feel a common and uniting bond with their fellow Jews who have settled in the ancestral home. Accustomed as we are to breathe the free air of American life, we take pride that the air of Israel is also free. American Jews properly recognize that the continuity of their Jewish life which is important to our American pluralistic society is intertwined with the democratic and spiritual redevelopment of Israel. Because American Jews view Israel in the words of a distinguished rabbi as "religion in action" they are proud to lend and urge support to this democratic State of Israel.

To me, like Justice Brandeis, the true test of an American is this: that he is one who does not conceal but affirms his origin, who is proud of whatever it may be, and who recognizes that in the plurality of American life is our strength and the source of the freedom that we so proudly profess in the world.

The genius of American life is that in this free and tolerant land there is room here for men of any race, religion, and ancestry. Our strength is in this diversity

of cultures and traditions freely honored and cherished—not in an enforced uniformity. The only uniformity or merger of identity which America has the right to and should expect of its citizens is that politically they are solely American citizens. There is no room at the polls for Protestant-Americans, Catholic-Americans or Jewish-Americans. But there is every need in our national life for the spiritual ideals of both the Old and New Testaments and every room for both the wearing of the shamrock on St. Patrick's Day and the celebration of Columbus Day; for both President Kennedy's and Senator Javits' sentimental journeys to their ancestral homes.

I conclude by asserting that there is every reason for Americans—Jewish and non-Jewish—to support that great adventure in human freedom, Israel, an adventure which parallels that great adventure in liberty, the United States of America.

#### THE COMMUNITY HEALTH SERVICES EXTENSION AMENDMENTS OF 1965

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker I wish to express my great pleasure at the unanimous approval by the House yesterday of the Community Health Services Extension Amendments of 1965. I was on the floor of the House earlier in the afternoon and was in my office for the remainder of the day. I heard the first bells for a record vote on H.R. 2986, but the second bells did not ring in my part of the Old House Office Building and hence I missed the rollcall vote. I have reported this fact to those in charge of the bell signals, but I also want to record my strong approval and support for this legislation.

I was one of those who introduced legislation to create these community health centers, and it is this legislation enacted in 1963 which H.R. 2986 will extend and amend. Coming as I do from a district and a State with a substantial number of senior citizens and a burgeoning population, I am keenly aware of the need for Federal assistance to the total community in establishing facilities for meeting the health needs and especially the mental health needs of our people.

I voted for the extension of this program in the Rules Committee and strongly support it, and had I not by inadvertence been prevented from being on the floor I would have voted for H.R. 2986 with pride and personal satisfaction.

#### INTER-AMERICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK CONFERENCE IN PARAGUAY

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I was given leave of absence last week, having been assigned to serve as an official delegate to the Inter-American Development Bank Conference, in Paraguay.

During this period, certain issues were acted upon by the House, and I would like at this time to state the positions I would have taken, had I been present to vote on them.

I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 86, in favor of authorizing appropriations for the National Council on the Arts on an annual basis. I have long advocated such a Council and feel this legislation is most helpful to implement its admirable objectives.

I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 85, in support of Mr. KEOGH's motion that the House recede from its disagreement with the Senate's addition of \$942,000 for subsidies for helicopter services in New York City, Los Angeles, and Chicago.

I would have voted "yea" on rollcall vote No. 82, for passage of the Water Quality Act of 1965. This, too, is extremely desirable legislation and is a long step forward in the fight on water pollution.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 78, and "yea" on rollcall No. 79, against recomittal, and for passage of H.R. 6497, the bill to increase the U.S. contribution to the International Monetary Fund. As a member of the International Finance Subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee, I attended the hearings on this bill, and strongly supported its enactment. The bill increases our quota to the International Monetary Fund by 25 percent, to a total of \$5,160 million. This increase will give the United States additional funds upon which to draw to alleviate our current short-run balance-of-payments deficit. This bill strengthens the International Monetary Fund, and thereby enhances the stability of exchange markets, and promotes international trade.

#### PRESIDENT'S REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL FUNDS

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Congress, I am sure, will give immediate approval to the President's request for additional funds to cover Defense Department needs, despite the fact that President Johnson was inconsistent and disappointing in his public address to the assembled Members of Congress this morning.

It was most disappointing for me to hear the President discuss the crises in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic without stating that our policy is to completely remove the Communist menace to both of these countries. The President was laboriously carrying water on both shoulders in that he was asking

Congress for additional military funds while literally begging the Communists to enter into negotiations.

It is inconsistent for us to have made the necessary and dramatic move in the Dominican Republic without logically developing a policy of completely eliminating Communist subversive activities in that country and reinstating a program which would produce a legitimate government in Cuba, since the Castro government is directly involved in the Dominican revolt and in Red guerrilla activities in other Latin American lands.

Negotiations in Vietnam will be fruitless if they permit continued Communist subversion in Laos and Cambodia and leave North Vietnam as an unmoled Red bastion. If we are to follow our obligation to preserve peace with freedom for our allies in southeast Asia, enforcement of a policy which would prevent North Vietnam from supporting aggression is necessary.

The President is obviously weakening in the face of growing Communist pressure and the shrill cries of appeasement coming from many of his party's leading congressional figures. Therefore, it is necessary for the public and the Republican Members of Congress to reinvigorate the President's determination to maintain a strong stand in defense of our present commitments and to logically carry out a policy of thwarting all Communist activities in the Western Hemisphere. Furthermore, we must stop the Reds cold in southeast Asia and we cannot equivocate on that point.

STATEMENT OF PRESIDENT JAMES M. NABRIT, JR., OF HOWARD UNIVERSITY CONCERNING ORGANIZATION KNOWN AS STUDENTS FOR ACADEMIC FREEDOM

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I enclose for the record very interesting articles which appeared in the Washington Post on April 28, and in the U.S. News & World Report of May 10, and which quoted President James M. Nabrit, Jr., of Howard University, concerning an organization known as Students for Academic Freedom.

I want to congratulate President Nabrit for his forthright statement, and say that activities of this group have been called to my attention by other officials in other universities. I hope more university officials will express their opinions concerning this organization, because, as President Nabrit stated:

They must be unmasked for the frauds they are. They must be fought in every arena, and they must not be permitted to prevail.

The articles follow:

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 28, 1965]

HOWARD UNIVERSITY UNREST BLAMED ON OUTSIDE FORCES

(By Stephen C. Rogers)

President James M. Nabrit, Jr., of Howard University yesterday blamed recent unrest at Howard on a few students he believes may be influenced by "external disruptive forces."

"They are people who cloak themselves in the mantle of civil rights and plot and plan in secret to disrupt our fight for justice and full citizenship," Nabrit said in a statement approved by the university's board of trustees.

"They must be unmasked for the frauds they are. They must be fought in every arena, and they must not be permitted to prevail."

At a press conference yesterday, Nabrit said he was referring to the Students for Academic Freedom.

The group sponsored a demonstration at Howard last Friday to protest compulsory ROTC, class attendance rules and the University's action in changing the status of a philosophy professor. About 350 students gathered for the demonstration.

Nabrit said the demonstration violated no university rule, and the school has taken no steps to discipline its leaders.

"But," he warned, "I will not sit idly by and see the university become a place of lawlessness and disorder."

He added that on one occasion he saw two known Communists on a Student for Academic Freedom picket line.

Nabrit also expressed concern over "increasing evidence of a lack of respect for duly constituted authority" both at Howard and outside it.

Of protest demonstrations generally, he said "they are not the only answer. They are reaching a point of diminishing returns. We must adhere to a rule of law."

He also defended the Howard student body against apathy charges and said the university places "no restriction" on the right of students to demonstrate as individuals. Howard has not disciplined students arrested in demonstrations, he said.

[From the U.S. News & World Report, May 10, 1965]

MORE CAMPUS UNREST—ARE REDS TO BLAME?

WASHINGTON.—Campus unrest has now broken out at Howard University, the Nation's biggest predominantly Negro college.

As on other troubled campuses, outside agitation and Communist influence are being cited.

Said Dr. James M. Nabrit, Jr., president of Howard: Outsiders may be infiltrating rights groups "to disrupt our fight for justice and full citizenship."

"OPEN DEFIANCE"

Howard has more than 9,000 students. Many leaders in national civil-rights organizations have come from its student body and faculty. Now, says Dr. Nabrit, there are "growing signs of open defiance of law and order" on the campus.

A group called Students for Academic Freedom, which includes some faculty members, has demonstrated against alleged repressive rules and regulations, and had demanded abolition of compulsory military training at the school.

In a statement read to a freshman assembly, Dr. Nabrit said a campaign seemed to be afoot "to bring the university into general disrepute."

"I will not sit idly by and see the university become a place of lawlessness and disorder," he said.

"We must beware of some people who come to us like the Greeks bearing gifts. They do not believe in civil rights for anyone. \* \* \*

"They are children of lawlessness and disciples of destruction.

"They are people who cloak themselves in the roles of civil-righters and plot and plan in secret to disrupt our fight for justice and full citizenship.

"They must be unmasked for the frauds they are. They must be fought in every arena, and they must not be permitted to prevail."

REDS IN A PICKET LINE

Dr. Nabrit's statement was approved by the university's board of trustees. Discussing it in a later news conference, he said he had seen at least two Communists in a picket line outside the school. Excerpts of his remarks, as recorded by NBC-TV:

"I saw some Communists passing out throwaways. I saw some Communists helping deliver placards. \* \* \* These are grown people, they're not students \* \* \*"

"They have never denied that they were Communists, and they have been the leaders in the Communist group in Washington all the years I've been here. We had to put them out of the NAACP."

Dr. Nabrit said that Howard may have been designated as the target for the kind of outside agitation that stirred outbreaks at the University of California's Berkeley campus.

"I don't see any relationship whatsoever to the civil rights movement at Berkeley or here," he said. "I don't see that it's got anything to do with the civil rights movement. At Howard, everybody from the president on down has been participating in civil rights."

COMMUNISM AND MARTIN LUTHER KING

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Speaker, the association of men and organizations with Communist leanings with the leaders of the civil rights movement is well known to those in authority, but these connections are very seldom made known to the people.

In an effort to circumvent the news blackout on this vital subject, I plan, from time to time, to make these associations known by publishing them in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, where censorship cannot erase the facts from public view.

The first of these insertions concerns the Communist Party and Martin Luther King and appeared in the current issue of the National Review Bulletin, volume 17, No. 19.

Today's award for throwing the baby out with the bathwater goes to the U.S. Supreme Court for its 5-2 decision overturning Louisiana's Subversive Activities and Communist Control Act. The Court heard, and apparently agreed with, arguments that the Act had been used to "harass" civil rights activities. The case concerned the Southern Conference Education Fund, which assists civil rights groups, especially the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee



("Snick"). According to the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, SCEF is the successor to the Southern Conference for Human Welfare, which was "conceived, financed, and set up by the Communist Party in 1938 as a mass organization to promote communism throughout the Southern States." When the SCHW became the SCEF in 1948, it retained its offices, telephone, publication (the Southern Patriot—also cited as subversive) and officers, all but one of whom have been identified under oath as Communists. Rev. Fred Shuttlesworth, a militant leftist and close colleague of Martin Luther King, is now president of SCEF, but it is for the most part operated by Carl and Anne Braden, both of whom have been identified in sworn testimony as Communists. Mrs. Braden is editor of the Southern Patriot. On October 5, 1963, after an 11-month investigation, SCEF's offices in New Orleans were raided by local and State police who seized a truckload of its records and arrested three of its officers, acting on the authority of the Communist Control Act. The action before the Supreme Court evolved from SCEF's efforts to recover these records. In the meantime, the Louisiana State Committee on Un-American Activities, also authorized by the act, prepared an excellent two-volume report on SCEF's activities, extensively documenting Communist involvement in the civil rights movement.

#### HORTON BILL TO COMBAT ARAB BOYCOTT OF ISRAEL

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the body of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I take pleasure in informing my colleagues that I have introduced a bill today making it the policy of the United States to oppose restrictive trade practices or boycotts fostered or imposed by foreign countries against other countries friendly to our Nation. The purpose of this legislation is to assist American exporters to defy the intimidation of the Arabs and their demands in connection with Israel trade.

For over 13 years there has existed an agreement among the various Arab States to boycott Israel, Israeli goods, and all companies engaged in business arrangements—direct or indirect—with Israel. To coordinate this malicious activity, the Arab countries created the Central Arab Boycott of Israel Office, located in Damascus, Syria.

This office wages a continual war of pressure on the great number of foreign companies that do business in the Arab world in order to prevent their undertaking similar activities in Israel. The boycott office ferrets out the names of companies engaged in commerce with Israel to compile its blacklist, a roster of those forbidden to market products or services in the Arab countries.

The boycott office operates in such a way as to make it necessary that our American Government condemn it in the strongest possible fashion. It has demanded from independent American businessmen answers to a detailed questionnaire relating to their commercial

practices. This information then is used to determine whether the company goes on the blacklist.

Many of our companies have refused to yield to this blackmail. As a result, they have been denied a market in the entire Arab world. While their refusal redounds to their everlasting credit, I think we can agree that they should not be made to suffer the kind of economic discrimination which results from the fact that others may have given in to the threats of the Arabs.

There is no reason why we should not establish in the clearest and most convincing terms that the United States opposes this kind of harassment of its business firms. We also must write a positive national policy of our opposition to any and all such trade practices which are designed to intimidate countries whose feelings are friendly to the United States.

Mr. Speaker, that is the purpose of the bill I have offered. I urge Congress to move its enactment as promptly as possible.

#### AID'S OPERATION AS REPORTED BY COMPTROLLER GENERAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOLAND). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ERLBORN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. ERLBORN. Mr. Speaker, on three other occasions I have discussed the Agency for International Development's operation as reported to the Congress in studies issued by the Comptroller General.

Today I will mention a final report and, at the same time, earnestly request that the Congress direct the House Government Operations Committee to initiate an immediate investigation into all activities of AID and AID reports to the Congress.

I find this final report concerning AID most disturbing.

The Comptroller General charges the Agency for International Development with presenting misinformation and distorted reports to the Congress, and in turn to the public.

The Comptroller General's report entitled "Ineffective Utilization of Excess Personal Property Program in the Foreign Assistance Program" was issued on April 12, 1965.

The title alone should prompt careful attention on the part of the Congress because, in its 1965 budget presentation to Congress, AID reported savings of more than \$43 million in the area of excess personal property.

Here is what AID claimed in its fiscal year 1965 budget presentation:

Excess Property Offices: AID will need \$400,000 to maintain the offices handling its program of using excess property wherever possible in place of costlier new equipment in carrying out development projects. Section 608 of the Foreign Assistance Act authorized AID, in anticipation of overseas needs, to acquire and process equipment declared excess for Government requirements and provide this to AID missions at prices far below those of new property. By using

U.S. Government-owned excess property wherever possible in fiscal year 1963, AID saved more than \$43 million in its overseas assistance projects.

#### The Comptroller General reports:

In the first place, the total amount of excess property transferred to foreign countries by AID in fiscal year 1963 was about \$34.4 million, and not \$43 million as stated in the presentation. Furthermore, as shown on pages 12 to 14 of this report, we concluded from our review that the use of excess property by AID in fiscal year 1963 resulted in little, if any, direct dollar savings so that the statement that AID saved more than \$43 million is erroneous.

The presentation also indicates that the \$400,000 was being requested for all the offices handling its program of using excess property. This is incorrect. The \$400,000 was intended to cover only the administrative costs of the AID excess property regional offices in Frankfurt and in Tokyo. The AID administrative costs associated with the three excess property regional offices and the marshaling sites in the United States, as well as those of AID/Washington and AID's overseas missions that are attributable to excess property utilization, are not funded from the \$400,000 but from other AID funds. Accordingly, the total cost to AID for administering the excess program, exclusive of any accessional costs for the property itself, is far greater than the \$400,000 shown in the presentation.

Our review disclosed that the erroneous statements were due to extremely loose budgetary preparation practices by AID in preparation of the material quoted above. Seemingly inappropriate AID offices were involved in preparation of the budget presentation, incorrect source information was used, and a transposition error apparently occurred. Most significant was the fact that the individuals who had responsibility for AID's excess property program did not directly participate in preparation of the material to be included in the budget presentation or review the material after it was prepared.

The Comptroller General goes on to note that:

We have in the past strongly urged AID and predecessor agencies to disclose clearly and fully all significant aspects of aid activities. In commenting on our findings on December 18, 1964, AID implied general satisfaction with the budget presentation and did not indicate that it would attempt to improve further presentations. We are repeating our recommendations \* \* \* that the Agency make more informative, clear, and accurate disclosure of significant data in annual program presentations.

The Comptroller General, in this report, mentions two previous studies that I earlier called to your attention and notes that in the case of assistance to CENTO—B-146849, dated March 5, 1964—and in the case of Children's Hospital in Poland—B-146787 dated June 17, 1964—his office reported inaccurate and misleading reports were being sent to the Congress by the Agency for International Development.

The Comptroller General could not be more concise in his charges.

The Agency for International Development has been lying to the Congress. In addition, AID is guilty of inefficiency, waste, ineptness, and unsatisfactory conduct.

I wish to briefly review the matters I have discussed during the last 4 days.

We have found AID guilty of ineffective administration of aid to other nations.

We have found AID guilty of disregarding public law and policies adopted by the Congress and the Executive branch.

We have found AID guilty of losses of millions and millions of dollars.

And finally, we have found AID guilty of misrepresentation to the Congress, of including false statements in reports to the Congress, and thus deliberately misleading the Congress and the public.

I stress that these reports from the Comptroller General but scratch the surface of the multiplicity of AID activities in 85 nations.

Can the Congress remain inactive and allow the Agency for International Development to flout public law, to waste millions of dollars, to file erroneous statements and reports?

Can Congress allow the reports and recommendations of the Comptroller General to go unheeded?

Can the Congress fail its duties?

Once again, Mr. Speaker, I request that this Congress ask the House Government Operations Committee to start an immediate investigation into the activities, practices, claims, records, and statements of the Agency for International Development.

Not only has AID been found inefficient, but AID has been caught preparing and filing misrepresentations with the Congress.

This type of conduct on the part of a bureaucratic agency cannot go unattended.

This record on the part of an agency, in whose trust we have placed much of the administration of our foreign aid program, cannot continue.

Let us do more than scratch the surface.

Let us deliberately and carefully and painstakingly find out exactly what is the record of the Agency for International Development.

I urge immediate action.

#### NATIONAL SMALL BUSINESS WEEK

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOLAND). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS] is recognized for 35 minutes.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, as we approach National Small Business Week, declared by President Johnson to begin May 24, next, it is fitting and appropriate that we help lay the groundwork for this national observance.

As chairman of the House Small Business Committee, I want to emphasize first that it is the continuing obligation of my committee to study the problems of the Nation's small businessmen and to make recommendations from time to time to the Congress that will assist in the solution of those problems.

Today there are more than 4.7 million small businesses in the Nation.

Their contributions to our economy are great. Their value to our country continues to be immense.

Today our economy is prosperous and growing. This is not just happenstance. This is not just an accident. It is basically because of the enlightened economic policies of President Johnson and his administration—policies that made it possible for our free enterprise system to function more efficiently and for the small businessman to overcome problems of capital and management deficiency that have been his traditional Achilles heel.

President Johnson, and before him, President Kennedy, advanced and applied a policy of economic expansion—a policy that meant the creation of new opportunities rather than a divisive, corrosive policy of taking from the "haves" and giving to the "have nots."

This policy of economic expansion has created a new era of opportunity for American small businessmen.

This policy of promoting growth and opportunity for advancement is consistent with the distinguished record of President Johnson relative to small business when he was a Member of the House and of the Senate.

I shall document his record in support of small business in detail later in my remarks, but I want to make it clear at this point that Lyndon Baines Johnson, as a Member of Congress, was not only a supporter of legislation enacted to assist the small businessman, but that in many instances he was the prime mover in this advancement.

The Small Business Act, the Small Business Investment Act and the SBA community development programs, are examples of his leadership in this field.

As far back as 1938 he voted for legislation that laid the groundwork and set the pattern for most of our contemporary small business assistance programs.

And so Lyndon Johnson was not only in on the ground floor of small business assistance programs. He was the foreman who supervised construction of much of the ground floor. He has been a longtime champion of the small businessman.

#### BENEFITED ALL SECTORS

This policy of economic expansion has benefited all sectors of our economy, the small businessman, the big businessman, the wage earner, the teacher, the farmer, the great, broad mainstream of our economy.

And one of his greatest accomplishments—one that history surely will record—has been the success of President Johnson in uniting the business and economic interests of this Nation; in unifying elements that traditionally have been antagonistic. He has led them to see that when a nation expands its economy, it expands opportunities for all segments of our economy and our society—and all segments therefore benefit.

In Detroit, Mich., on September 7, he said:

We labor to increase the total abundance of us all. Responsible business knows that fair wages are essential to prosperity. Responsible labor knows that fair profits are essential to rising employment. Farmers and city dwellers, bankers, and laborers know that by strengthening each group we strengthen the Nation; by pursuing the growth of all, we advance the welfare of each.

And so this consensus he has achieved has meant an America united in a common purpose, the building of a better society for all Americans, the building of a Great Society where all men will have the opportunity to achieve fulfillment.

Because of the very nature of small business—the fact that it consists of millions of small independent enterprises—its importance is sometimes shaded in the news by the reports of activities of the giants in our economy. Small business is sometimes lost in the shadow of the golden glow cast by the publicity mills of these corporations.

And so it is for that reason that I want to discuss today the importance of small business to this Nation and its status today; the role played by Lyndon Baines Johnson in the progress of small business.

We frequently hear this question posed in this time of economic giantism: Just how important is small business? Is it significant? Is it important? Or should it be relegated to the economic "twilight zone" to muddle along with no real significant role to play in our economy?

I say to you today that small business is important. It is significant. It is more important, more significant, and more necessary than ever before.

As the President pointed out in his proclamation of March 24, announcing Small Business Week, 9 out of 10 American businesses are small and they provide more than a third of the Nation's goods and services. Small business provides the livelihood for 75 million Americans. Small business accounts for more than 70 percent of the Nation's dollar volume in construction, in retail, in wholesale, in services, and more than 30 percent of the value added in manufacturing.

So, let no one tell you that small business is unimportant. Let no one tell you that Lyndon Johnson did not champion the cause of small business while he served in Congress. Let no one tell you that just because in the Presidency Lyndon Johnson has united all segments of our economy in a consensus of purpose, he is any less concerned with the growth of small business.

#### BIG IN HIS VISION

Lyndon Johnson said on the Senate floor on June 30, 1960:

In the changing times in which we find ourselves today, the small businessman is small only in the size of his operation. He is big in his vision, big in his courage, big in the role he is playing to make the American economic machine work with maximum efficiency and minimum waste.

Lyndon Johnson, since becoming President, has done everything possible to strengthen the position of the individual small businessman, to make his role larger and more important.

The \$11 billion tax reduction, for example, has been a prime instrument in helping the small businessman to new profits.

When he signed the tax reduction legislation at the White House a year ago last February 26, the President said:

Business, as well as individuals, benefit by this tax cut. And small business benefits the most. For example—

He continued—

if you own a small unincorporated business, your tax will drop by 27 percent.

The tax rate on larger corporations dropped 4 percent.

The revision of the depreciation schedule on new equipment and the investment tax credit have provided additional inducement for business expansion.

The Department of Commerce reports that this Nation has entered its 51st month of economic expansion—a peacetime record that has driven our gross national product up 23 percent since the first quarter of 1961 when this administration took office.

Industrial expansion is up 35 percent; retail sales are up 30 percent; plant and equipment expenditures are up 45 percent; civilian employment is up 4.7 million—or 7 percent—our unemployment rate has dropped from 7.1 percent in May of 1961 to 4.7 percent in March of this year; personal income is up 27 percent.

The average weekly wage is up 21 percent, corporate profits, after taxes, are up 65 percent from the first quarter of 1961. And yet with all these economic barometers moving up, the wholesale price index has remained stable.

We are thus experiencing an expanding economy, a stable expansion based on solid growth with an expanding population and increased purchasing power.

#### SMALL BUSINESS GROWTH

Statistics also tell the story of the growth, expansion, and higher profits of small business.

The small business sector has swelled to 4.7 million units—95 percent of all business. New business incorporations increased last year to a record 198,000 while business failures dropped to an 8-year low—21 percent below the post-war peak in 1961.

Sales of small manufacturing corporations and small retailers exceeded 1963 totals and established new peaks for the period of expansion. After-tax earnings by small manufacturing corporations were 40 percent higher during the first three quarters of last year. The income of unincorporated enterprises gained an estimated 4 percent in this same period.

I am not saying there are no clouds on the horizon; there are many.

I am concerned about the increasing trend toward mergers. There were another 1,800 last year.

I am concerned about the effects of dual distribution and vertical integration on small business. We hope to take legislative steps during this term of Congress to further protect the interests of small business and thus assure the continuance of our free competitive economy and our free enterprise system.

I am concerned about the constant battering of small business by the dimensions of change affecting virtually every phase of their activity.

I am concerned—as my committee is concerned—about the effect of urban blight on small business. We are concerned about the effect of displacement by urban renewal and highway projects.

We are cognizant of all of these problems. President Johnson knows about them. The Small Business Administration knows about them. We are working together in an effort to help the small businessman to adjust to these changes.

To help meet this challenge, the Small Business Administration has built the most effective program of assistance in our history.

And this has been made possible because of the support given SBA by the President, the House Small Business Committee, and by the Congress.

#### SPECIFIC DEVELOPMENTS

Here are some of the specific developments in this area:

On May 26, 1964, President Johnson announced a liberalized lending program which broke through barriers that had blocked efforts to reach the very small businessman. This new program authorized loans of \$15,000 for as long as 6 years and it put the emphasis on the integrity and the character of the individual rather than on hard collateral. Under this program, by last January 31, SBA had approved 4,694 loans averaging \$9,500 each. Today the very small businessman is being reached effectively for the first time.

In 1964, SBA shattered all previous records with approval of 10,707 loans for \$425.8 million, and a chief factor in this upsurge in volume was the breakthrough to the very small businessman. This liberalized small loan program announced by the President accounted for 40 percent of all loans approved.

President Johnson has given his personal endorsement to SCORE—the Service Corps of Retired Executives—one of the most creative concepts of government and community cooperation to come out of Washington in this decade. This program has wedded the brainpower of the retired business executive to the problems of the struggling small businessman. These volunteers thus far have helped more than 2,000 small businessmen and the program is just getting off the ground.

The President's war on poverty program is concentrating one of its attacks on the needs of the small business sector because, as President Johnson has eloquently pointed out, the stability and the continuity and the drive for progress of any community comes from the small businessman who has a personal stake in that community. To combat poverty, the small business sector must be strengthened. And so, title IV of the Economic Opportunity Act authorizes loans of \$25,000 for 15 years and provides assistance in developing a network of small business development centers across the Nation. These centers will provide management assistance and counseling to small businessmen in deprived areas where these services are most urgently needed.

Perhaps more than any other President since Thomas Jefferson, President Johnson has grasped the significance of the role of small business in this Nation.

In a statement which I am including with my remarks, the President pointed out to small businessmen last August 29,

at a meeting at the White House, just how important is their role in community leadership. To these small businessmen he said:

Your leadership at the local level will decide the quality of our cities, our classrooms, our countryside; the quality of life in our country for a century to come.

In response to a special message from the President on January 27, 1964, Congress enacted legislation to provide further assistance to the small businessman displaced by urban renewal and Federal highway construction.

More recently President Johnson has dramatized the role of the small businessman by inaugurating National Small Business Week, which begins May 24, and by continuing the annual award to the Small Businessman of the Year.

But his record as President is only a part of the story. When the small business investment company program developed problems, it was President Johnson who reaffirmed his faith in the SBIC, which he was instrumental in creating. Today there are more than 10,000 small businesses operating with \$500 million in financial help from SBIC's. This program has been strengthened and improved with greater latitude given for investments and funding. SBIC's disbursed \$200 million to small businessmen in the fiscal year ending March 31, 1964, and ended the fiscal year with assets of \$750 million.

The community development program—another SBA program which the President was instrumental in helping bring into being—created 7,800 new jobs in 1964. A new high of 200 development loans totaling \$30.7 million was made to help communities diversify and strengthen their economies. Since its inception in 1958, this program has created almost 30,000 jobs and resulted in 572 loans totaling \$84.6 million. The potential and possibilities of this program are almost unlimited in both urban and smalltown areas throughout the Nation.

#### IN THE HOUSE

As a Member of the House, Lyndon Johnson had a consistent record and a productive concern for small business. This is reflected in his votes, proposals, and statements made as a Member of this body.

On March 4, 1938, less than a year after he had been elected to the House of Representatives, he voted for a bill that set a pattern for the development of a permanent Small Business Administration and its framework of financial assistance programs for small business.

This bill gave the Reconstruction Finance Corporation sweeping authority and latitude in making loans to small business, loans from \$200 up with no limit on terms.

He voted to strengthen the small business programs as they developed.

In 1946, he advanced an amendment to the Surplus Property Act of 1944 to require the Federal Government to give small businessmen returning from the war priority in purchasing war surplus materials with which to set up shop.

In 1947, he voted for similar legislation giving RFC the power to buy such

surplus properties for resale to small businessmen.

He advocated an overall economic policy designed to strengthen our free enterprise system and, specifically, to stimulate growth of small business.

One major vote in this area, cast by him as a Member of the House, was for the Employment-Production Act of 1946, which set a national policy of full employment and provided machinery to keep tabs on our national economy.

#### IN THE SENATE

As a Member of the U.S. Senate, he criticized monopoly control of prices in 1948 when he proposed formation of a bipartisan Breadbasket Committee to combat inflation.

He voted to set up a permanent Select Committee on Small Business in the Senate in 1950 to make a continuing study, survey, and investigation of small business problems.

He advocated legislation to assist small businessmen in drought areas with liberal loans and sought to protect the small businessman from monopoly and price fixing.

He consistently supported SBA and the additional lending authority it required. He threaded his way through a parliamentary logjam in 1957 to obtain passage of legislation assuring continuance of SBA, then on a temporary basis, after its authorizing legislation had expired.

One of his greatest contributions has been in the area of making equity and long-term capital available to small business to close a basic financing gap needed by small business.

He introduced legislation creating the Small Business Investment Division and the Small Business Investment Company programs along with the community development loan program. He was one of the sponsors and guiding forces in securing passage of this legislation.

On August 8, 1958, he told the Senate that in that year its legislation on behalf of small business was of particular importance.

In 1959, as majority leader, he supported legislation to extend the SBIC program as well as appropriations to strengthen the SBA in all its operations.

In a speech on the Senate floor on June 30, 1960, he reviewed the impact of the SBIC and the community development program on the Nation's small business. He said:

It has strengthened their role in the national economy, a role which has always seemed to me to be vital to the well-being of Americans, whether they are small businessmen, big businessmen, farmers, working men, or housewives.

In industrial and natural resource areas beset by technological change, he said:

It is small business that is the key to the task of providing new opportunity. I believe the small businessman has rendered a service to all parts of our economy by showing the way to a full realization of our potential.

To document my statements, Mr. Speaker, I add herewith a detailed summary of the Johnson record on small

business as a Representative, Senator, and as President.

#### SUMMARY

In 1938, as a Member of the House, Lyndon B. Johnson voted for a landmark bill that laid the foundation for subsequent acts that led to creation of Small Business Administration as a temporary, and then a permanent, agency with a comprehensive small business assistance program. This bill gave the Reconstruction Finance Corporation power to make loans to small business, extended the length of loans to a point of no limitation, liberalized credit requirements, extended the funding limit from \$500 million to \$1.5 billion, and removed a requirement that had blocked assistance to any business that had begun operation after January 1, 1934.

In this 1938 bill, the determining factor for evaluating the RFC loan applications that loans shall be of such sound value or so secured as reasonably to assure repayment was incorporated in the SBA Act in 1963 and in 1958.

RFC's authority to lend money to small business had been suspended when this legislation was proposed.

The bill passed the House by 339 to 6.

#### WAR SURPLUS—1945

Introduced amendment to Surplus Property Act of 1944 to give veterans' preference, after U.S. Government, in purchase of war surplus. This was of significance to small businessmen who could, under this proposal, buy materials and equipment with which to set up business at much less than market price.

He explained that this bill would:

Help them (veterans) a little in beginning life anew by removing some of the handicaps and barriers encountered in finding a place in our economic order.

In 1947, he voted yes on a bill authorizing Reconstruction Finance Corporation to buy war surplus for resale to small businessmen.

#### EMPLOYMENT-PRODUCTION ACT—1946

Voted for Employment-Production Act setting national policy of full employment and to aid in development and maintenance of conditions favorable to stimulating new business, and especially small business. This legislation required the President to submit periodic economic reports to Congress, set up the Council of Economic Advisers in the Executive Office of the President, and created the Joint Economic Committee of Congress.

This legislation assured a closer analysis of the economy to point the way to legislation designed to strengthen the economy and the position of small business.

Passed 322 to 84.

#### EXTENDS RFC—1947

Voted yes on bill extending life of Reconstruction Finance Corporation with its small business lending power for 2 years. A report showed that 90 percent of RFC loans had been for less than \$100,000, indicating its volume of loans to small business.

This bill also authorized RFC to purchase surplus property for resale to

small business when such disposition is required to strengthen the competitive position of small business.

Bill passed 335 to 4.

#### BREADBASKET COMMITTEE—1948

Asked Congress to authorize appointment of Breadbasket Committee, to combat inflation by President to launch a bipartisan war on inflation.

The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD records this statement:

It is no answer to say that men must eat less. Nor do we answer the problem of inflation when we allow the profits of some companies to swell from 50 to 85 percent above the 1946 limits.

We are not answering the problem of inflation when we sanction by inaction, the growing trend toward monopoly control of prices—a trend pointed up this week by the FTC, which showed that since 1940 big business had gobbled up little businesses by mergers to the tune of \$5.2 billion in assets.

#### COMMITTEE PLAN—1950

Voted yes on substitute amendment to provide for five additional Senators—three from majority party and two from minority party—appointed by President of Senate—one from Senate Finance Committee, one from Senate Interstate, one from Senate Judiciary and other two from other standing committees—to be ex officio members of Senate Banking and Currency Committee on matters relating to small business. Motion rejected 49 to 33.

#### TEMPORARY SPECIAL COMMITTEE

Voted yes on amendment to create a Special Committee on Small Business to continue during the 81st and 82d Congresses.

#### PERMANENT COMMITTEE

Voted yes on substitute amendment to create a permanent Select Committee on Small Business, consisting of 13 Members appointed by President of Senate at the beginning of each Congress. Committee to study, survey, and investigate problems of small business, but with no legislative authority. Amendment approved 56 to 26.

#### SMALL DEFENSE PLANTS—1953

Called for passage of \$300,000 appropriation for the Small Defense Plants Administration. Passed.

The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD reports this comment by the then Senator Johnson:

I think the joint resolution is essential and necessary. I hope it will be approved by the Senate without delay.

#### AID TO DROUGHT AREAS—1954

Introduced bill to make small businessmen in drought-stricken areas eligible for SBA disaster loans. Such legislation was enacted in 1955.

The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD reports these statements:

It (the effect of the drought) is a chain reaction which hits everybody. It (the bill) is designed to help small business in the drought areas of Texas and the Southwest.

#### ANTITRUST—1955

Called up for action a bill to increase from \$5,000 to \$50,000 the maximum criminal penalties imposed for violation of the first three sections of the Sherman Act. Action: Passed.

## AUTO DEALER—1956

Voted yes on bill protecting the rights of franchised auto dealers. The bill made it possible for franchised auto dealers to bring suit in district Federal courts to recover compensatory damages sustained because of the failure of automobile manufacturers to act in good faith in complying with the terms of the franchises, or in terminating or not renewing franchises with the dealers. Bill passed 75 to 1.

## SMALL BUSINESS STUDY—1957

Asked unanimous consent to take up Senate Resolution 42 authorizing Senate Small Business Committee to investigate problems of small and independent business. Resolution passed.

## AIDS PRINTED

Asked Senate to approve printing of 10,700 additional copies of a tax aid for small business being distributed by the Senate Select Committee on Small Business. Approved.

## INCREASED LENDING AUTHORITY

Supported, moved for passage, and spoke for bill authorizing \$65 million in additional lending authority for SBA. Bill approved by voice vote.

The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD records this Johnson statement:

It is a source of deep satisfaction that one of the earliest actions of this Congress should be on a measure affecting small business.

This, of course, is not a bill which purports to solve the problems of small business. It simply adds to the lending authority of the Small Business Administration so that small businesses may acquire some of the capital they need in order to survive.

I think there was never a time in the history of the Nation when the problems of small business needed our attention more than it is needed now.

It is my belief that before this session has ended we will have to act in more basic fields of the problems, unless we are willing to see small business become smaller until it reaches the vanishing point. The facts and figures that are available indicate that the situation is becoming desperate.

Between 240 and 250 business firms will go bankrupt every week of this year.

The tight money policy hits the small businessman much harder than it hits the big fellow.

The continual trend toward mergers of big companies leaves a smaller share of the market for the average businessman.

Rising costs all along the line add to the difficulties of a small firm in meeting expenses.

And, of these increasing costs, one of the most important is the increasing cost of money. This is something that is felt all along the line—by business, by government, and by the average citizen.

This is a situation that can change our whole economy. The rising cost of money and other necessities represents a constant squeeze on small business, and the squeeze will eliminate many as time goes on.

I have never been opposed to big business as such, as it plays a vital role in our whole economy. But we face the problem of maintaining the free enterprise system, and that is something we cannot do unless we help small business remain vital and flourishing.

This is a problem which must be tackled from many standpoints.

Again, Mr. President, let me express my deep satisfaction that one of the first acts

of this Congress is designed to meet one of the immediate needs of small business.

## RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

Called to Senate's attention need to increase role of small business in research and development:

The Federal Government pays for almost two-thirds of all research and development in the United States, and 95 percent of these subsidies are paid to companies employing more than 500 workers.

This is another example of the squeeze being put on small business in the country today.

## EXTENSION OF SBA

Led the parliamentary effort to get life of Small Business Administration extended after it expired July 31, 1957. He succeeded in getting it on the calendar for a vote. Because of parliamentary blockage he had been unable to call up bill before.

Extension approved and lending authority increased by \$75 million.

The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD includes this statement by Johnson:

It is imperative that the Senate act on the measure extending the Small Business Administration.

## INVESTMENT COMPANIES

Introduced revised bill to create the SBIC program, a substitute for the Capital Banks Bill, because of data released by a Federal reserve system study. Bill approved by voice vote.

The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD records this statement:

In March of this year, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System released the first two parts of a very comprehensive study of the financing needs of small businesses.

An evaluation of the first two parts of this study would indicate that other proposals (other than the bill he introduced on January 30, 1958, and other proposed legislation in this area) for financing small business are worthy of consideration.

I now introduce for appropriate reference on behalf of myself and other Senators a bill which contains some of the features embodied in S. 3191 (the bill introduced Jan. 30, 1958) but which approaches the problem in ways which seem to be indicated by some of conclusions of the Federal Reserve study.

## BASIC PROGRAMS APPROVED

Sponsored legislation to set up two basic SBA programs: the Small Business Investment Company and community development programs.

The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD records this Johnson statement:

With the reporting of S. 3651 (the bill under discussion) to the Senate, we have an opportunity to approve a significant program of aid to small business. And it is a program, Mr. President, that does no violence to free enterprise, that does not raise the specter of Federal control of, and competition with, private business.

S. 3651 is a progressive and necessary bill. Its purpose is to provide assistance in an area where today neither Government nor private institutions can offer that assistance. As every Senator knows from his study of small business needs, commercial banks are not in the business of providing equity capital to small businesses. Neither are they prepared in most instances to offer long-term credit to such businesses.

And while the Small Business Administration is authorized to make loans of maxi-

mum 10-year duration, with a possible further 10-year extension, it cannot under law go further toward meeting the real long-term requirements of small businesses, and it cannot provide equity capital in any case.

The idea of the investment companies is an old one, and it has many parallels on the statute books today \* \* \*.

Eventual private ownership is what is proposed here for the small business investment companies. It has worked before \* \* \* and may I say that it has resulted in neither the socialization of our farms, of our homes, nor in any disastrous raids on the Treasury \* \* \*.

Mr. President, there is no doubt about the need for the kind of assistance proposed by this bill. The Government cannot today answer to this need, Mr. President; neither can private lending institutions. Given the authority we propose in the bill, the need can, in part, be met.

## SBIC'S STRENGTHENED—1959

Called up for action and supported S. 2611, a bill strengthening the small business investment company program. The bill passed on voice vote.

The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD lists this statement by the then Senator Johnson:

As one who originally was very much interested in this proposed legislation, I must say that at this point I am somewhat disappointed when I find that only 27 small business investment companies have been formed.

I hope the action \* \* \* the Senate is taking today will encourage the formation of more of these small business investment companies.

## FUNDS INCREASED

Called up for action and supported bill to provide SBA with sufficient funds, \$75 million to operate regular business loan program into 1950. Amendment agreed to by voice vote.

## SBIC BILL

Called up for action a bill exempting small business investment companies from the holding company tax. Amendment agreed to by voice vote.

## IMPORTANCE OF SMALL BUSINESS—1960

Emphasized importance of small business in Senate speech, June 30, 1960.

The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD reports this Johnson statement:

It was my great pleasure in 1958 to be a sponsor of the Small Business Act of that year. The measure has proven helpful to the Nation's independent businessmen. It has strengthened their role in the national economy, a role which has always seemed to me to be vital to the well-being of Americans, whether they are small businessmen, big businessmen, farmers, workmen or housewives.

In this challenging new decade I am of the opinion that the small businessman has an even more vital role to play. In an era of changing technology in agriculture and business, the place of the small businessmen becomes a rallying point for all segments of the economy.

I think it is clear that the place of the small, independent businessmen in our changing economic picture deserves attention from other segments of the economic household. It deserves this attention, I think because there lie in this important sector of our economy the answers to some of the problems in other segments of our economy.

In areas where changing agricultural technology has caused difficulties for the farmer,

small business often has the answer to a re-ordering of the economy.

Throughout the traditional agricultural sections of the Nation, the small manufacturer and the independent operator of processing and servicing firms are the foundation for a new economic vitality. In the industrial and natural resource areas where changing productive technology is causing problems of unemployment and population migration, small business again is a key to the task of providing new opportunity.

These developments, it seems to me, point up once again the basic strength of the individual who really believes in the American dream of opportunity for all. Through the years, the small independent businessman has been on the firing line of the economy, sowing the way of opportunity and service.

In the changing times in which we find ourselves today, the small businessman is small only in the size of his operation. He is big in his vision, big in his courage, and big in the role he is playing to make the American economic machine work with maximum efficiency and minimum waste.

Nothing is more important to our Nation in these times than full use of our potential. I believe the small businessman has rendered a service to all parts of our economy by showing the way to a full realization of our potential, by pointing up how the American dream of opportunity for those who will grasp it can be made reality.

For these reasons I wish to say that small business deserves continued and sympathetic attention by all. Small business has proven it can shoulder the task which faces it.

We here should ever be ready to turn an understanding ear when the small businessman speaks of his problems, or when he offers constructive advice on how Congress can help in the big job of making the economy run at full efficiency.

I, for one, will ever be ready to do this, and I am of the opinion that by doing so I will be serving the best interests of the Nation, of its small businessmen, its big corporations, its consumers and workers.

#### PROCUREMENT BILL

Called-up bill to increase SBA revolving fund by \$75 million, to assure small business a greater share of Federal procurement, and including a program requiring prime contractors to allocate work to small business subcontractors. Bill approved.

As President, Lyndon Johnson, on February 28, 1964, signed into law an amendment to the Small Business Investment Act which enabled the small business investment companies to obtain additional financial help from the Government in strengthening their capital structure.

As President, Lyndon Johnson urged Congress to appropriate an additional \$100 million to the revolving fund for the small business loan program, and this appropriation has been recently provided by the Congress.

As President, Lyndon Johnson has proclaimed National Small Business Week and has been aggressive and consistent in advancing programs for the benefit of small business and our economy.

I join with the President and others in giving due recognition to the American small businessman in his importance to our Nation and his contribution to our country.

#### STATUTES, REGULATIONS, POLICIES, AND PRACTICES OF SELECTED FOREIGN COUNTRIES PROVIDING FOR PREFERENCES FOR DOMESTIC MATERIALS AND FIRMS IN THE AWARDING OF PUBLIC SUPPLY AND PUBLIC WORKS CONTRACTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOLAND). Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, before inserting in the RECORD the fifth of a series of documents demonstrating how foreign governments give preference to their own industry and labor in negotiating contracts for public works projects, I include the following news story from the May 1 issue of the Toronto, Ontario, Financial Post:

#### L.B.J. HITS "BUY AMERICAN" CLAUSE IN MASS TRANSIT BILL

WASHINGTON.—President Johnson is making a significant "freer trade" move in Congress.

He is seeking repeal of a "Buy American" section in a bill passed last year which, in effect, was the most protectionist move ever made by Congress. The section put a complete ban on any foreign firm having any part of an estimated \$400 million procurement program in a mass transit scheme.

Canada would be only affected marginally by the ultraprotectionist action because not too many Canadian companies would bid on the procurement program. Nevertheless, Ottawa voiced its unhappiness because of the principle involved. Other nations complained, too, particularly Britain, Germany, and Japan.

So far, the administration has not picked up much domestic support for its move. The only strong backing has come from the free trade group, the Committee for a National Trade Policy. The committee says not only is the "Buy American" section bad in itself, but it encourages State, county, and city governments to follow suit with their own restrictions against buying from foreign companies.

The "Buy American" provisions in the present law have led civilian agencies of the U.S. Government to order that a foreign bid must be 6 to 12 percent below a U.S. firm in order to get the business. The Pentagon applies a 50-percent rule. Canada, however, is exempted from this Pentagon regulation under the Canada-United States defense production-sharing program.

As author of the "Buy American" section of the Mass Transit Act to which the article refers, I should like to point out that my amendment merely specifies that our Government is now required under provisions of this legislation to do exactly what other governments—including Canada—have long practiced under standard administrative procedures. I have thus provided a modicum of protection for American firms and workers who pay the taxes that Government spends for materials used in the mass transit program. As you will note in the report on foreign trade policies which follows, Canadian departments accomplish the same purpose in behalf of Dominion businesses and workers by including, as a matter of "administrative discretion," a clause in contracts requir-

ing the use of Canadian labor and materials.

The Canadian Federal Department of Public Works requires that the Provincial authorities accept tenders only from contractors who reside in the particular Province or in another Province of Canada on contracts for the construction of highways, bridges, tunnels, and other similar projects which are financed jointly by the Federal Government and the Canadian Provinces. Moreover, all material for such projects must be purchased in Canada if possible. Further, each Province gives preference in its purchasing to manufacturers, wholesalers, or agents located in the Province.

In stating that the "Buy American" section of the Mass Transit Act was "the most protectionist move ever made by Congress," the Financial Post is essentially factual and serves to call attention to our delinquencies, past and present, in these matters. Now perhaps Congress will at long last come to recognize that American industry and labor need considerably more assurances that the Federal Government will favor domestic over foreign supplies and materials when negotiating public works contracts.

The mass transit program represents only a fraction of the vast expenditures made by Government in letting contracts for roads, dams, hydroelectric plants, and various other public works projects. Congress made a step in the right direction when it adopted the "Buy American" amendment in 1964, but there is still a long way to go toward getting American workers the same treatment extended to their counterparts elsewhere in the world by more enlightened official policies. Close perusal of Canada's policies will disclose that the U.S. Government is guilty by comparison of neglect and disrespect of our workers when we fail to give them first call on providing materials and supplies which their own taxes are helping to buy.

The Financial Post quotes a free trade committee as stating that the "Buy American" section is not only "bad in itself, but it encourages State, county, and city governments to follow suit with their own restrictions against buying from foreign companies."

Mr. Speaker, evidently the policy of buying at home also appeals to elected officials in the political subdivisions of Canada, as evidenced in my study of the individual Provinces. Those listed below comprise more than 80 percent of the Dominion's population and of course account for a predominance of tax revenue and expenditures. Note particularly that preference for Canadian products is specifically stipulated in various acts covering purchasing policies of British Columbia, Manitoba, Nova Scotia, and Saskatchewan. In Quebec, the Hydroelectric Commission is on record that it will pay up to 15 percent more for a Quebec product than for a foreign product. In contrast, the "Buy American" amendment to the Mass Transit Act limits total advantage for U.S. products and supplies.

The study of buying policies for public works projects in Canada—No. 5 in

my series on foreign governments— follows:

CANADA

(Member of GATT and OECD)

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

In the case of Government departments other than the Department of Defense Production and Defence Production (1951) Limited, the procedures governing the awarding contracts are prescribed in the Government Contracts Regulations (P.C. 1964-1467 of September 23, 1964; S.O.R. 164-390, Canada Gazette, Part II, Vol. 98, No. 19, October 14, 1964), which were issued under the provisions of the Financial Administration Act (Rev. Stat. Canada, 1952, c. 116), as amended. A copy of the Regulations is attached hereto as Schedule A.

Contracts are divided into three categories with different tendering requirements established for each category as follows:

(1) Construction contracts (including repairs and alterations to works)—Tenders must be invited by public advertisement (which includes advertising in the public press) except where:

(a) the work is one of pressing emergency in which delay would be injurious to the public interest;

(b) the work can be more expeditiously and economically executed by the employees of the appropriate contracting authority; or

(c) the estimated cost of the work is less than Can. \$15,000 and, in view of the nature of the work, it is not advisable to invite tenders.

(2) Purchase contracts (contracts for the supply of articles, commodities, equipment, goods, materials or supplies)—Tenders must be invited by public advertisement or from a representative list or lists of suppliers, except where

(a) the need is one of pressing emergency in which delay would be injurious to the public interest;

(b) there is only one available source of supply;

(c) the estimated cost is less than Can. \$15,000 and, in view of the nature of the purchase, it is not advisable to invite tenders; or

(d) the contract is one of a class of contracts designated by the Treasury Board as a class in respect of which the invitation of tenders is not required.

(3) Service contracts—Tenders must be invited by public advertisement or from a representative list or lists of suppliers, except for those cases or classes of cases as to which it is not considered in the public interest to do so.

Under the provisions of the Defense Production Act, 1951 (Rev. Stat., 1952, c. 62), as amended, the Department of Defense Production procures material, equipment and supplies (including services) on behalf of the Department of National Defense, Defence Construction (1951) Limited, a government corporation organized under the provisions of Section 6 of the 1951 Act, undertakes construction on behalf of the Department of National Defense.

The Government Contract Regulations are not applicable to the Department of National Defense (except for provisions relating to bonds and security deposits), but its procurement practice is substantially the same as that followed by other Government departments. The Department does not, however, rely to the same extent as other departments on public advertisement for tenders and places more reliance on invitations for offers against specifications from lists of suppliers deemed to be in position to compete for the particular contract. The 1951 Act also gives the Department more flexibility and somewhat greater authority in purchasing, particularly to meet urgent defense requirements. The Act allows the

Department to enter into contracts of greater value without prior approval by the Treasury Board than is the case for civil departments. Moreover, under certain circumstances, for example, during an emergency when delay would not be in the public interest or where there is only one source of supply or where there is need for defense secrecy, the Department is permitted by law to negotiate a contract directly with one firm or a few firms rather than use one of the other two methods.

The tendering procedures of Defence Construction (1951) Limited are the same as those for Government departments except for classified works as to which tenders are invited from a representative list of companies deemed qualified to perform the work satisfactorily.

In early 1965 the supply procurement responsibilities of the Department of National Defense were being expanded to include procurement for most civil departments. The development is described in the following excerpt from a speech made by Hon. C. M. Drury, Minister of Defense Production (and Industry), to the Purchasing Agents Association of Toronto on February 10, 1965:

"The [Canadian Government] Supply Service is a direct result of the recommendations of the Royal Commission on Government Organization, better known as the Glasco Commission. Following their detailed analysis of the activities of the Federal Government, the Commission recommended that a new Department of Supply be formed around the existing Department of Defence Production. The essence of their many recommendations on purchasing and supply was to form not only a consolidated purchasing agency, but also to group the supply activities relating to the civil departments and agencies in the same organization. This would then enable the Government to take advantage of all the opportunities for savings and improvements that would result from consolidation. The Government decided to proceed with these proposals.

"During the past eighteen months, Defence Production has been busily engaged in planning for its transformation into a new Department of Supply. Two important components of the new Department will be the Canadian Government Supply Service and the Canadian Government Purchasing Service. The latter consists of ten central purchasing branches, each of which specializes in the bulk buying of certain commodities or the procurement of major equipment."

There are no Canadian acts or regulations which discriminate in favor of Canadian firms and Canadian products. In practice, however, if the cost of Canadian goods is not higher than the laid-down duty-paid cost of imported goods, preference is given to the Canadian goods. A considerable element of discretion permitting discrimination derives from the fact that the larger contracts require approval of the Treasury Board, which is, in effect, a committee of the Cabinet. Accordingly, in deciding whether or not a preference should be given in a particular case for goods of Canadian origin, the Government is in position to take into account all relevant factors.

The Treasury Board also controls purchasing by the majority of Government corporations and agencies. There are, however, a number of Crown companies, corporations and boards (all of which are corporate bodies) established by special acts of the Canadian Parliament whose purchasing is to a large extent outside the jurisdiction of the Treasury Board and not subject to the Government Contract Regulations. Most of them are of a commercial nature with functions relating to transportation, marketing, trading or manufacturing.

The Canadian customs tariff also affords some opportunity for discrimination in favor of Commonwealth firms and suppliers. The tariff is protective and three-column. Goods from the United States are accorded most-favored-nation or middle rates, but the lowest or preferential rates are reserved for the United Kingdom and other Commonwealth countries. The highest or general rates apply to imports from countries with which Canada has no treaty or trade agreement.

In recent years, Canadian Government departments have been endeavoring to give preference to Canadian firms and Canadian materials by including, as a matter of administrative discretion, a clause in contracts requiring the use of Canadian labor and materials. Although the clauses vary in wording, most of them embody the phrase "consistent with proper economy".

Trade associations, and in particular the Canadian Manufacturers' Association, have conducted active "Buy Canadian" campaigns in recent years. In the brief of the Association to the Royal Commission on Canada's Economic Prospects in 1955, the Association urged the inclusion of a standard clause in all Government contracts which would provide as follows:

"To the full extent to which the same are procurable, consistent with proper economy and the expeditious carrying out of this contract, Canadian labour, parts and materials shall be used in the work."

The Federal Department of Public Works requires that, in contracts for the construction of highways, bridges, tunnels, etc., which are financed jointly by the Federal Government and the Provinces, the Provincial authorities accept tenders only from contractors resident in the particular Province or in another Province of Canada. Moreover, all material must be purchased in Canada in so far as possible.

By virtue of the joint defense procurement policy originating in the "Statement of Principles for Economic Cooperation" approved by the Letter Agreement dated October 26, 1950, between the United States and Canada (I UST 716), Canada and the United States do not discriminate against each other's materials and products in the field of procurement of defense supplies. The policy is not, however, applicable to defense construction. A copy of Section 6-103.5 of the Armed Services Procurement Regulation issued by the United States Department of Defense, which describes the policy as applied by the United States, is attached hereto as Schedule B.

Similar principles are applied by the Canadian Department of Defense Production.

PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENTS

Each Province tends to give preference in its purchasing to manufacturers, wholesalers or agents located in the Province. Active "Buy Provincial" campaigns have been conducted in recent years, particularly in the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec.

British Columbia: The British Columbia Purchasing Commission is charged with the purchase of all supplies required for the public service of the Province, including public institutions under the administration of the Provincial Government. Section 9 of the Purchasing Commission Act (Statutes of British Columbia, 1943, c. 54), provides as follows:

"Notwithstanding any of the provisions of this Act, the Commission shall have power to give a preference in favour of goods produced, manufactured, or sold within the Province; and in the case of goods required within a local area of the Province, in favour of goods produced, manufactured, or sold within that area."

The preference policies of the Commission are described in the following excerpt from

a letter dated January 27, 1965, from the Chairman of the Commission:

"Since the Government of the day must find the money to pay for all purchases we do work under the publicly stated policy rules of the Government such as calling for quotes on all purchases, lowest quote to be accepted, other things being equal. Preference is given first to goods manufactured in B.C., then those made in Canada and lastly those made outside of Canada."

The policy of the British Columbia Hydro and Power Authority, a Crown agency which is responsible for the instruction, maintenance and operation of provincially owned public utilities facilities, is indicated by the following excerpt from a letter dated January 25, 1965, from the Manager, Purchasing & Stores Division, of the Authority:

"\* \* \* I enclose, for your information, two copies of a brief summary of our purchasing policies. You will note that this policy contains the statement that: 'All things being equal, suppliers located in British Columbia will be given preference.' This clause does not prevent us, from time to time, giving a slight price preference to a British Columbia supplier if we considered it in the interest of the Authority to do so. It is our practice, if practical, to invite public tenders for all material, supplies and service over an estimated \$10,000. On large contracts, where we deem it advisable, we seek tenders on a world-wide basis and place advertisements in leading trade publications in various countries, including the United States. In the U.S. we often advertise in the 'International Construction Reporter.'"

Manitoba: The Purchasing Bureau is responsible for the purchase of nearly all equipment and supplies required for provincial operations. Section 7(d) of the Government Purchases Act (Revised Statutes of Manitoba, 1954, c. 104) provides that "wherever possible, qualities and prices being equal, products or manufactures of the Province of Manitoba shall be purchased."

Nova Scotia: Under the provisions of the Purchases Act (Statutes of Nova Scotia, 1964, c. 4) the Government Purchasing Agency is responsible for the purchase of all supplies that are required by the Provincial departments and most Provincial boards, commissions and agencies. Section 8(b) of the Act provides that the Agency:

"(b) Insofar as it may be consistent with good business practices and in the public interest, shall purchase Nova Scotia products and purchase from persons who maintain and operate places of business in the Province of Nova Scotia;"

Ontario: The policy of the Department of Highways is indicated by the following excerpt from a letter dated February 3, 1965, from the Director, Legal Branch, of the Department:

"The Department follows the policy of buying supplies on a competitive basis with no limitation on the nationality of the bidder. If, however, two identical bids are submitted, one by a Canadian supplier and one by a non-Canadian supplier, the contract would be awarded to the Canadian supplier."

Quebec: Both the Provincial Purchasing Service of Quebec and the Quebec Hydro-Electric Commission are reported to discriminate in favor of Quebec firms. According to statements made to the press in 1963 by Commissioner Gignac, the Commission will pay to 10 percent more for a Quebec product than for the equivalent item manufactured elsewhere in Canada and up to 15 percent more for a Quebec product than for a foreign product. The Commission operates a public utility system which supplies electric light and power requirements to municipalities (including Greater Montreal and surrounding districts), industrial and commercial undertakings and private citizens. It is said to be the largest single buyer in Quebec with projected capital expenditures for 1964 exceeding Can\$250,000,000.

The Provincial Purchasing Service is reported to have adopted guide lines essentially the same as those of the Hydro-Electric Commission. The policy is carried out by the Provincial Treasury Board, which must approve all purchases over Can\$25,000.

Saskatchewan: Under the provisions of The Purchasing Agency Act (Revised Statutes of Saskatchewan, 1953, c. 42), the Saskatchewan Government Purchasing Agency is responsible for the purchase of most supplies required by provincial departments. Section 7 of the act provides as follows:

"In acquiring supplies the agency shall acquire, to the extent that it is practicable, supplies produced or manufactured in the province or sold by persons carrying on business in the province."

According to a booklet entitled "Selling to the Saskatchewan Government," published by the Ministry of Industry and Information, the basic provincial purchasing policy is to "purchase 'Made in Saskatchewan' goods, providing quality and price are satisfactory."

#### PRINCIPAL SOURCES

##### General

British Board of Trade "Canada: Selling to Federal and Provincial Public Departments" (London, 1963).

##### Federal

(1) Report dated March 17, 1960, to the United States Department of Commerce by the Commercial Attaché of the United States Embassy in Ottawa, entitled "Canadian Government Procurement Policies and Practices".

(2) Foreign Service Despatch No. 248 dated September 22, 1960, from the United States Embassy in Ottawa, entitled "Canadian Government Procurement Policies and Practices".

(3) Canadian Department of Trade and Commerce, "Selling to the Canadian Government" (Ottawa, 1960).

(4) United States Department of Commerce, "Import Tariff System of Canada," Overseas Business Reports, No. OBR 63-10 (January 1963).

##### Provincial

(1) Airgram No. A-35 dated March 4, 1964, from the United States Consulate in Quebec, P.Q., entitled "The 'Buy Quebec' Policy".

(2) Letter dated January 27, 1965, from the Chairman, British Columbia Purchasing Commission, Victoria, British Columbia to Cravath, Swaine & Moore, New York.

(3) Letter dated January 25, 1965, from the Manager, Purchasing & Stores Division, British Columbia Hydro and Power Authority, Vancouver, British Columbia, to Cravath, Swaine & Moore, New York.

(4) Letter dated February 17, 1965, from the General Purchasing Agent, Purchasing Bureau, Province of Manitoba, Winnipeg, Manitoba, to Cravath, Swaine & Moore, New York.

(5) Letter dated February 19, 1965, from the Director of Purchases, Government Purchasing Agent, Province of Nova Scotia, Halifax, Nova Scotia, to Cravath, Swaine & Moore, New York.

(6) Letter dated February 3, 1965, from the Director, Legal Branch, Department of Highways, Province of Ontario, Downsview, Ontario, to Cravath, Swaine & Moore, New York.

(7) Letter dated February 19, 1965, from the Director of Purchases, Purchasing Agency, Province of Saskatchewan, to Cravath, Swaine & Moore, New York.

#### SCHEDULE A. FINANCIAL ADMINISTRATION ACT GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS REGULATIONS (P.C. 1964-1467)

At the GOVERNMENT HOUSE

AT OTTAWA,

Wednesday,

the 23rd day of September, 1964.

Present: His Excellency the Governor General in Council.

His Excellency the Governor General in Council, on the recommendation of the

Treasury Board, pursuant to the Financial Administration Act, is pleased hereby to revoke the Government Contracts Regulations made by Order in Council P.C. 1954-1971 of 16th December, 1954<sup>1</sup>, as amended<sup>2</sup>, and to make the annexed Government Contracts Regulations in substitution therefor.

#### REGULATIONS RELATING TO GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS Short Title

1. These Regulations may be cited as the Government Contracts Regulations.

#### Interpretation

2. (1) In these Regulations:

(a) "Advance payment" means a payment made by or on behalf of Her Majesty under the terms of a contract prior to any work or specified part thereof being done under the contract;

(b) "Amount", where used in respect of a contract, means the cost or price of the contract whether such cost or price is fixed or estimated;

(c) "Contract" means

(i) A contract for the construction or repair of a work (in these Regulations called a "construction contract");

(ii) A contract for the supply of articles, commodities, equipment, goods, materials or supplies including a contract for printing or reproduction (in these Regulations called a "purchase contract");

(iii) A contract for the furnishing or performance of a service of any kind (in these Regulations called a "service contract"); and

(iv) A lease or an agreement whereby Her Majesty acquires a leasehold interest in, or a license to occupy, real property situated in or outside Canada (in these Regulations called a "lease");

entered into by or on behalf of Her Majesty in right of Canada;

(d) "Contracting authority" with respect to any contract, means

(i) The appropriate Minister as defined in subparagraphs (i) and (ii) of paragraph (a) of section 2 of the Financial Administration Act, and

(ii) The corporations named in Schedule B to the Financial Administration Act, the National Capital Commission, the National Battlefields Commission and the Northern Canada Power Commission;

(e) "Progress payment" means a payment made by or on behalf of Her Majesty under the terms of a contract in respect of a portion of the work done under the contract prior to the completion of the whole work to be done under the contract;

(f) "Public advertisement" means advertising in the public press; and

(g) "Tender" means,

(i) With respect to a construction contract, a tender invited by public advertisement, and

(ii) With respect to a purchase or service contract, a tender invited by public advertisement or from a representative list or representative lists of suppliers.

(2) For the purposes of these Regulations and for greater certainty each one of the following shall be deemed to be a construction contract:

(a) A contract for the supply of a structure prefabricated in accordance with plans and specifications supplied by the contracting authority;

(b) A contract for the construction or repair of a vessel;

(c) A contract relating to dredging;

(d) A contract relating to demolition, and

<sup>1</sup> SOR/54-691, Canada Gazette, part II, vol. 89, No. 1, Jan. 12, 1955, p. 175 and Statutory Orders and Regulations Consolidation 1955, vol. 2, p. 1350.

<sup>2</sup> SOR/61-361, Canada Gazette, part II, vol. 95, No. 17, Sept. 13, 1961.



(e) A contract for the hire of equipment to be used in or incidental to the execution of a work.

**Application**

3. (1) Except as provided in this section, these Regulations apply to all contracts.

(2) These Regulations do not apply to

(a) Contracts entered into by a corporation named in Schedule C to the Financial Administration Act other than the National Capital Commission, the National Battlefields Commission and the Northern Canada Power Commission;

(b) Contracts entered into by a corporation named in Schedule D to the Financial Administration Act;

(c) Contracts for the conveyance of mail entered into under the Post Office Act;

(d) Contracts entered into by the Canadian Wheat Board;

(e) Contracts entered into by the National Film Board;

(f) Contracts for the purchase of metal entered into under the Currency, Mint and Exchange Fund Act;

(g) Contracts for construction of buildings entered into under the Veterans Land Act; and

(h) Contracts entered into under the Indian Act relating to Indian moneys as defined in that Act.

(3) Parts I to IV of these Regulations do not apply to contracts entered into under the Defence Production Act.

(4) Where by the Defence Production Act the approval of the Governor in Council is necessary or a report is required to be made to the Governor in Council

(a) In respect of a contract, or

(b) In respect of any of the matters mentioned in paragraph (f) of section 15 of the Defence Production Act,

such approval may be granted by and such report shall be made to the Treasury Board.

4. Nothing in these Regulations authorizes the appointment or employment of any person as an officer, clerk or employee of Her Majesty.

5. Where there is no authority under these Regulations for a contracting authority, without the approval of the Treasury Board,

(a) To enter into a contract; or

(b) To increase the amount payable under a contract,

the Treasury Board may approve the entry into the contract by the contracting authority or the increase in the amount payable under the contract, as the case may be.

6. Except as provided in these Regulations, no contract shall be entered into without the approval of the Treasury Board.

**Part I. Construction contracts**

**Tenders**

7. (1) Before any construction contract is entered into, the contracting authority shall invite tenders therefor, except where

(a) The work is one of pressing emergency in which delay would be injurious to the public interest;

(b) The work can be more expeditiously and economically executed by the employees of the appropriate contracting authority; or

(c) The estimated cost of the work is less than fifteen thousand dollars and it appears to the contracting authority, in view of the nature of the work, that it is not advisable to invite tenders.

(2) Where tenders have been obtained pursuant to subsection (1) and it appears to the contracting authority not to be expedient to let the contract to the lowest tender, the contracting authority shall obtain the approval of the Treasury Board to pass by the lowest tenderer.

**Entry Into Construction Contracts**

8. A contracting authority, without the approval of the Treasury Board, may enter into a construction contract if

(a) The amount payable under the contract does not exceed fifteen thousand dollars, or

(b) The amount payable under the contract exceeds fifteen thousand dollars but does not exceed one hundred thousand dollars and not less than two tenders have been obtained and the lowest tender accepted, but the contracting authority shall make a report monthly to the Treasury Board in respect of every construction contract, the amount payable under which exceeds ten thousand dollars, that was entered into without the approval of the Treasury Board during the preceding month.

9. (1) The amount payable under a construction contract shall not be increased without the approval of the Treasury Board except:

(a) Where the contract was entered into pursuant to paragraph (a) of section 8,

(i) In the event that before the construction contract was entered into not less than two tenders were obtained and the lowest tender accepted, the amount may be increased

(A) By not more than five thousand dollars, or

(B) To fifteen thousand dollars, whichever results in the greater amount, and

(ii) In any other event, the amount may be increased to fifteen thousand dollars;

(b) Where the contract was entered into pursuant to paragraph (b) of section 8, the amount may be increased by not more than ten thousand dollars; or

(c) Where the contract was entered into with the approval of the Treasury Board, the amount may be increased

(i) By not more than ten per cent, or

(ii) By fifteen thousand dollars, whichever results in the lesser amount.

(2) Notwithstanding subsection (1) where the amount payable under a construction contract has been increased with the approval of the Treasury Board, the aggregate increased amount payable under the contract, being the aggregate of the amount payable under the contract before such increase and the amount by which the contract was so increased, may be further increased, without the approval of the Treasury Board,

(a) By not more than ten per cent, or

(b) By fifteen thousand dollars, whichever results in the lesser amount.

**Part II. Purchase contracts**

**Tenders**

10. Before any purchase contract is entered into, the contracting authority shall invite tenders therefor except where

(a) The need is one of pressing emergency in which delay would be injurious to the public interest;

(b) There is only one available source of supply;

(c) The estimated expenditure involved does not exceed fifteen thousand dollars and it appears to the contracting authority, in view of the nature of the purchase, that it is not advisable to invite tenders; or

(d) The contract is one of a class of contracts designated by the Treasury Board as a class in respect of which the invitation of tenders is not required.

**Entry into Purchase Contracts**

11. A contracting authority, without the approval of the Treasury Board, may enter into a purchase contract if

(a) The amount payable under the contract does not exceed fifteen thousand dollars, or

(b) The amount payable under the contract exceeds fifteen thousand dollars but does not exceed fifty thousand dollars and not less than two tenders have been obtained and the lowest tender accepted,

but the contracting authority shall make a report monthly to the Treasury Board in re-

spect of every purchase contract, the amount payable under which exceeds ten thousand dollars, that was entered into without the approval of the Treasury Board during the preceding month.

12. A purchase contract may provide for the making of progress payments or advance payments in such amounts and at such times as may be agreed to.

(a) In the case of a purchase contract entered into pursuant to section 11, by the contracting authority, or

(b) In any other case, by the Treasury Board.

13. (1) The amount payable under a purchase contract shall not be increased without the approval of the Treasury Board except:

(a) Where the contract was entered into pursuant to paragraph (a) of section 11

(i) In the event that before the purchase contract was entered into not less than two tenders were obtained and the lowest tender accepted, the amount may be increased

(A) By not more than five thousand dollars, or

(B) To fifteen thousand dollars, whichever results in the greater amount, and

(ii) In any other event, the amount may be increased to fifteen thousand dollars;

(b) Where the contract was entered into pursuant to paragraph (b) of section 11, the amount may be increased by not more than five thousand dollars; or

(c) Where the contract was entered into with the approval of the Treasury Board, the amount may be increased

(i) By not more than ten per cent, or

(ii) By fifteen thousand dollars, whichever results in the lesser amount.

(2) Notwithstanding subsection (1) where the amount payable under a purchase contract has been increased with the approval of the Treasury Board, the aggregate increased amount payable under the contract, being the aggregate of the amount payable under the contract before such increase and the amount by which the contract was so increased, may be further increased without the approval of the Treasury Board

(a) By not more than ten per cent, or

(b) By fifteen thousand dollars, whichever results in the lesser amount.

**Part III. Service contracts**

**Tenders**

14. Before a service contract is entered into the contracting authority shall invite tenders except in such cases or classes of cases as the contracting authority considers the invitation of tenders not to be in the public interest.

**Entry into Service Contracts**

15. (1) A contracting authority may, without the approval of the Treasury Board, enter into a service contract (other than a contract that results in the appointment or employment of a person as an officer, clerk or employee of Her Majesty) for any of the following purposes:

(a) For engineering, architectural and other services required in respect of the planning, preparation for or supervision of the construction or repair of a work

(i) If the amount payable under the contract does not exceed twenty-five thousand dollars, or

(ii) If the amount payable under the contract exceeds twenty-five thousand dollars but does not exceed fifty thousand dollars and the specific work project has been approved in writing by the Treasury Board;

(b) For the hire of equipment, with or without the operator thereof, if

(i) The amount payable under the contract does not exceed fifteen thousand dollars, or

(ii) The amount payable under the contract exceeds fifteen thousand dollars but does not exceed fifty thousand dollars and

not less than two tenders have been obtained and the lowest accepted

except in the event such equipment is to be used in or incidental to the execution of a work;

(c) For advertising services, if the amount payable under the contract does not exceed ten thousand dollars;

(d) For transportation services, regardless of the amount payable under the contract, if the service is to be furnished or performed by common carriers at rates not in excess of standard rates;

(e) For transportation services other than those described in paragraph (d) and for the hire or charter of vehicles, vessels or aircraft if

(i) The amount payable under the contract does not exceed twenty-five thousand dollars, or

(ii) The amount payable under the contract exceeds twenty-five thousand dollars but does not exceed fifty thousand dollars and not less than two tenders have been obtained and the lowest accepted;

(f) For the supply of electricity, gas, water (including sewage disposal services) or heat, regardless of the amount payable under the contract if the rates do not exceed the established rates charged to other comparable consumers in the same rate structure area in which the service is supplied, except that no contract shall be entered into without the approval of the Treasury Board where

(i) The rates charged are based on the value or assessed value of the property serviced, or

(ii) The contract involves payment by Her Majesty of negotiated installation or capital charges

(A) In the case of electricity, gas or heat in an amount exceeding five thousand dollars, or

(B) In the case of water, in any amount;

(g) For stenographic recording, reporting, transcription or similar services if the amount payable under the contract does not exceed five thousand dollars and the rates charged are no greater than the rates prescribed from time to time by the Treasury Board for those services;

(h) For maintenance services (including cleaning, laundry, drycleaning and towel services) and road clearing or snow, garbage and waste removal or disposal services if

(i) The amount payable under the contract does not exceed fifteen thousand dollars, or

(ii) The amount payable under the contract exceeds fifteen thousand dollars but does not exceed fifty thousand dollars and not less than two tenders have been obtained and the lowest accepted;

(i) For maintenance and inspection of elevators and escalators, regardless of the amount payable under the contract, if the rates charged are not greater than the rates prescribed from time to time by the Treasury Board for those services;

(j) For maintenance and inspection of boilers, fire alarm and sprinkler systems and other classes of equipment if

(i) The amount payable under the contract does not exceed fifteen thousand dollars, or

(ii) The amount payable under the contract exceeds fifteen thousand dollars but does not exceed fifty thousand dollars and not less than two tenders have been obtained and the lowest accepted;

(k) For the maintenance, repair, overhaul and refitting of vehicles, aircraft and other equipment if

(i) The amount payable under the contract does not exceed fifteen thousand dollars, or

(ii) The amount payable under the contract exceeds fifteen thousand dollars but does not exceed fifty thousand dollars and not less than two tenders have been obtained and the lowest accepted;

(l) For telecommunication services as follows:

(i) For telephone services, regardless of the amount payable under the contract, if the rates charged do not exceed the established rates charged to other comparable consumers in the same rate structure area in which the service is supplied and if the contract does not involve payment of capital or negotiated installation charges exceeding five thousand dollars,

(ii) In respect of all telecommunication services except as otherwise specified in this paragraph, if the amount payable under the contract for such service does not exceed fifteen thousand dollars and the contract does not involve payment of capital or negotiated installation charges exceeding ten thousand dollars,

(iii) In respect of rental of telecommunication equipment, if the amount payable under the contract for the rental of such equipment does not exceed fifteen thousand dollars and the contract does not involve payment of capital or negotiated installation charges exceeding ten thousand dollars,

(iv) For the rental of short or local lines, if the amount payable under the contract in respect of the rental of such lines does not exceed one thousand dollars, and

(v) In respect of rental of long lines, if the amount payable under the contract for the rental of such lines does not exceed fifteen thousand dollars;

(m) For air surveys and mapping services if

(i) The amount payable under the contract does not exceed twenty-five thousand dollars, or

(ii) The amount payable under the contract exceeds twenty-five thousand dollars, but does not exceed fifty thousand dollars and not less than two tenders have been obtained and the lowest accepted;

(n) For the relocation of powerlines, telephone lines, pipelines and similar installations that are not owned by Her Majesty, if the amount payable under the contract does not exceed one thousand dollars;

(o) For the processing of materials owned by Her Majesty if

(i) The amount payable under the contract does not exceed fifteen thousand dollars, or

(ii) The amount payable under the contract exceeds fifteen thousand dollars but does not exceed fifty thousand dollars and not less than two tenders have been obtained and the lowest accepted; and

(p) For catering services, if

(i) The amount payable under the contract does not exceed fifteen thousand dollars, or

(ii) The amount payable under the contract exceeds fifteen thousand dollars but does not exceed fifty thousand dollars and not less than two tenders have been obtained and the lowest accepted.

(2) A contracting authority, without the approval of the Treasury Board, may enter into a contract for the furnishing of performance of any service not specified in subsection (1), if the amount payable under the contract does not exceed five thousand dollars.

16. A service contract may provide for the making of progress payments or advance payments in such amounts and at such times as may be agreed to

(a) In the case of a service contract entered into pursuant to section 15, by the contracting authority, or

(b) In any other case, by the Treasury Board.

17. (1) No service contract the term of which exceeds five years shall be entered into without the approval of the Treasury Board.

(2) Subsection (1) does not apply to a service contract described in paragraph (f), (i) or (l) of subsection (1) of section 15.

18. (1) The amount payable under a service contract shall not be increased without the approval of the Treasury Board except,

(a) Where the contract was entered into, in accordance with these Regulations, without the approval of the Treasury Board, the amount may be increased to the maximum amount specified in section 15 for a contract of that kind; or

(b) Where the contract was entered into with the approval of the Treasury Board, the amount may be increased by not more than ten per cent.

(2) Where a service contract entered into with the approval of the Treasury Board has, set out in the Treasury Board approval thereof, the term or period during which the service is to be furnished or performed, the said term or period may, subject to paragraph (b) of subsection (1), be increased without the approval of the Treasury Board by not more than ten per cent.

19. Contracts for the performance of legal services may be entered into only by or under the authority of the Minister of Justice and these Regulations do not apply to such contracts.

#### Part IV. Leases

##### Entry into leases

20. (1) A contracting authority, without the approval of the Treasury Board, may enter into a lease,

(a) In the case of a lease required in connection with the administration of the Department of Public Works, where

(i) The annual rate calculated on the basis of the amount to be paid under the lease does not exceed fifteen thousand dollars and the term thereof does not exceed five years, or

(ii) The annual rate calculated on the basis of the amount to be paid under the lease exceeds fifteen thousand dollars but the total amount to be paid under the lease does not exceed fifteen thousand dollars; or

(b) In any other case, where

(i) The annual rate calculated on the basis of the amount to be paid under the lease does not exceed five thousand dollars and the term thereof does not exceed five years, or

(ii) The annual rate calculated on the basis of the amount to be paid under the lease exceeds five thousand dollars but the total amount to be paid under the lease does not exceed fifteen thousand dollars and the term thereof does not exceed one year.

(2) A contracting authority may, upon the termination of the term of a lease described in subparagraph (i) of paragraph (a) of subsection (1) or subparagraph (i) of paragraph (b) of subsection (1) of any premises, renew the lease or enter into a new lease of those premises, subject to the provisions set out in subsection (1) respecting the amount to be paid under the lease, but in no event, without the approval of the Treasury Board, may the contracting authority remain in continuous possession of the premises for longer than ten years except if each lease of the premises or each renewal of the lease is required in connection with the administration of the Department of Public Works and the amount to be paid under each such lease does not exceed five thousand dollars per annum.

(3) In no event, without the approval of the Treasury Board, may the contracting authority, upon the termination of the term of a lease, described in subparagraph (ii) of paragraph (a) of subsection (1) or subparagraph (ii) of paragraph (b) of subsection (1) of any premises, renew the lease or enter into a new lease of those premises except if the aggregate of amounts payable for possession of the premises under each lease of the premises and each renewal thereof does not exceed fifteen thousand dollars.

21. No contracting authority shall, without the approval of the Treasury Board, enter

into a lease of premises intended to be used as living quarters for officers or servants of Her Majesty.

#### General

22. Notwithstanding anything in these Regulations, the Treasury Board may, in respect of a particular contracting authority, upon notification to the contracting authority, increase or decrease any one or more of the amounts specified in Parts I, II, III, and IV.

23. Nothing in these regulations authorizes the making of an ex gratia payment.

24. Notwithstanding anything in these Regulations, a contracting authority may execute on behalf of Her Majesty

(a) Any form of agreement in use by a railway company for permission to construct or maintain a private crossing for any department or agency of the Government of Canada, or a pipe or cable crossing over, across or under property of the company; or

(b) Any agreement with a railway, telegraph, telephone or power company for permission to attach wires to poles of the company at rates not in excess of those normally charged for such permission.

#### Part V. Bonds and security deposits

25. In this Part,

(a) "Bid bond" means a bond given to guarantee entry into a contract that is

(i) In a form approved by the Treasury Board, and

(ii) In the amount of at least 10 percent of the amount that would become payable under the contract if it were entered into;

(b) "Comptroller" means the Comptroller of the Treasury appointed under the Financial Administration Act;

(c) "Contract" means

(i) A construction contract, and

(ii) Any other contract in respect of which, in the opinion of the contracting authority, it is in the public interest to obtain security to ensure the due performance thereof;

(d) "Holdback" means the amount withheld under a contract pursuant to section 40 of the Financial Administration Act and includes a holdback within the meaning of section 32 of these Regulations;

(e) "Labour and material payment bond" means a bond given to guarantee the payment of certain persons performing labour or supplying materials that is

(i) In a form approved by the Treasury Board, and

(ii) In the amount of at least 50 percent of the amount payable under the contract in respect of which the bond is given;

(f) "Performance bond" means a bond given to guarantee performance of a contract that is

(i) In a form approved by the Treasury Board, and

(ii) In the amount of at least fifty percent of the amount payable under the contract in respect of which the bond is given; and

(g) "Security deposit" means

(i) A certified cheque drawn on a bank to which the Bank Act or the Quebec Savings Banks Act applies, or

(ii) Bonds of the Government of Canada or of a company included in "National Railways" (as that expression is defined in the Canadian National Railways Capital Revision Act) unconditionally guaranteed as to principal and interest by the Government of Canada, if such bonds are

(A) Payable to bearer,

(B) Hypothecated to the Minister of Finance and Receiver General of Canada in accordance with the Domestic Bonds of Canada Regulations, or

(C) Registered in the name of the Minister of Finance and Receiver General of Canada.

26. Where tenders are called in respect of a construction contract or where the contracting authority deems it appropriate, the contracting authority shall require every

person wishing to enter into a contract to give to Her Majesty, to ensure the entry into the contract,

(a) A bid bond; or

(b) A security deposit in an amount, or having a par value, of not less than

(i) Ten per cent of the amount that would become payable under the contract, if it were entered into, where the amount payable does not exceed two hundred and fifty thousand dollars, or

(ii) Twenty-five thousand dollars plus five per cent of the amount by which the amount that would become payable under the contract, if it were entered into, exceeds two hundred and fifty thousand dollars, where the amount exceeds two hundred and fifty thousand dollars.

27. (1) Where a contract is entered into, a contracting authority shall require the contractor to give to Her Majesty

(a) A performance bond and a labour and material payment bond, or

(b) A security deposit in an amount calculated in accordance with paragraph (b) of section 26 and a labour and material payment bond.

(2) Where a contractor has not been able to obtain a labour and material payment bond as required by paragraph (a) or (b) of subsection (1) on making application therefor to at least two bonding companies, the contracting authority shall require the contractor to give to Her Majesty a security deposit in an amount calculated in accordance with paragraph (b) of section 26 together with an additional security deposit of at least ten per cent of the amount payable under the contract.

(3) Where a security deposit, other than an additional security deposit required pursuant to subsection (2), is required to be given by a contractor under this section, the amount of such deposit shall be reduced by the amount of any security deposit given pursuant to section 26.

28. (1) Notwithstanding section 26 or 27, in the case of a construction contract, the contracting authority may

(a) Accept security of less value or dispense with any security where

(i) The contract provides that the amount payable by or on behalf of Her Majesty is to be computed in relation to the cost incurred by the contractor, and

(ii) By the terms of the contract, the materials upon being incorporated in the work or otherwise appropriated to the contract become the property of Her Majesty;

(b) Accept security in such form and such amount as the contracting authority deems appropriate in the case of a contract for the construction or repair of a vessel;

(c) Limit the security deposit in respect of any one contract to one hundred thousand dollars, except that the amount of the additional security deposit required under subsection (2) of section 27 shall not be included therein; and

(d) Where the amount payable under the contract is less than twenty-five thousand dollars,

(i) Accept security in such form and such amount as the contracting authority deems appropriate, or

(ii) Dispense with any security.

(2) Where in the opinion of a contracting authority it is in the public interest to obtain security to ensure the due performance of a service contract or a purchase contract, the contracting authority may, notwithstanding section 26 or 27 in the case of the service or purchase contract, accept security in such form and such amount as the contracting authority deems appropriate.

29. Coupon bonds delivered as a security deposit under these Regulations shall have attached thereto all coupons that are unexpired at the time of such delivery.

30. Where a security deposit has been given under these Regulations in the form

of a certified cheque and the amount of the cheque has been paid into the Consolidated Revenue Fund, interest shall be allowed on the said amount from the day on which it is paid into the Consolidated Revenue Fund until it is repaid or otherwise disposed of, at the rates that from time to time are applicable to deposits in the post office savings bank.

31. Whenever the amount payable under a contract is increased by reason of extras, additions or extensions, the contracting authority may require such additional security as he or it considers necessary to ensure the due performance of the contract.

32. (1) Subject to subsection (2), where the contracting authority deems it necessary, a construction contract may provide that progress payments shall be made thereunder in such amounts and at such times as may be agreed to by the contracting authority.

(2) Progress payments in respect of a construction contract shall not exceed such amounts as will ensure that the holdback is at least

(a) Five per cent of the value of the work done and the materials supplied under the terms of the contract, as determined by the contracting authority, where a labour and material payment bond has been provided, or

(b) Ten per cent of the value of the work done and the materials supplied under the terms of the contract, as determined by the contracting authority, where a labour and material payment bond has not been provided.

(3) Subsection (2) does not apply to a shipbuilding contract or to any contract under which the amount payable is to be computed in relation to the cost incurred by the contractor.

33. (1) The security deposit shall be paid

(a) to any person

(i) Who gives such security deposit pursuant to paragraph (b) of section 26, and

(ii) With whom Her Majesty is not prepared to enter into the contract in respect of which the security deposit is given; or

(b) to the contractor where, having given a security deposit pursuant to paragraph (b) of section 26, the contractor furnishes a performance bond and a labour and material payment bond pursuant to paragraph (a) of subsection (1) of section 27.

(2) Where a contract has been satisfactorily performed or has been terminated for a reason that is not attributable to any fault of the contractor and Her Majesty has no claim against the contractor arising out of or relating in any manner whatsoever to the contract in respect of which the security deposit or holdback may be required, the security deposit and the holdback shall be paid to the contractor.

(3) Where, in respect of any contract, the security deposit or the holdback is in excess of the amount required by the contract and these Regulations, the amount by which such security deposit or holdback exceeds the amount required shall be paid to the contractor.

(4) Where the work, or any part thereof, performed in respect of any contract is handed over to Her Majesty and the contractor is not in default under the contract, the contracting authority may pay to the contractor the amount by which

(a) the aggregate of the security deposit and the holdback exceeds

(b) an amount equal to

(i) the amount obtained by multiplying by two the value of the work that, in the opinion of the contracting authority, is still to be performed under the contract, minus

(ii) the amount, if any, still payable by Her Majesty in respect of the work still to be performed under the contract.

(5) A contracting authority may direct that payments under this section be made to any person entitled thereto notwithstanding that such person is not a contractor or a person giving a security deposit pursuant to paragraph (b) of section 26.

34. Notwithstanding anything in these Regulations, a security deposit or holdback may be paid in such manner and at such time as the Treasury Board may direct.

35. Notwithstanding anything in these Regulations, the Treasury Board may authorize in any particular case or classes of cases the acceptance of security in a form and having a value other than prescribed in these Regulations.

36. (1) Where a security deposit, in the form of a certified cheque, is received from any person as a deposit incidental to a tender for a contract, the contracting authority shall hold the cheque

(a) until the tender is rejected, in which case the cheque shall be returned to the tenderer; or

(b) until the tender is accepted, in which case the cheque shall be forwarded to the Comptroller

(1) to be deposited to the credit of the Receiver General, or

(ii) in the event the contractor so directs, to be held uncashed, and thereafter the security deposit shall be dealt with in accordance with these Regulations.

(2) Where a security deposit, in the form of bonds, is received from any person as a deposit incidental to a tender for a contract, the contracting authority shall forward the bonds immediately to the Comptroller to be held by him or where the contracting authority considers its safe-keeping arrangements satisfactory, hold the bonds

(a) Until the tender is rejected, in which case the bonds shall be returned by the Comptroller or by the contracting authority, as the case may be, to the tenderer; or

(b) Until the tender is accepted, in which case the contracting authority shall

(i) In the event the bonds are being held by the contracting authority, forward the bonds immediately to the Comptroller to be held by him, and

(ii) In any event, notify the Comptroller that the bonds are to be dealt with in accordance with these Regulations.

(3) Where a bid bond, a labour and material payment bond or a performance bond is received by a contracting authority under these Regulations, the bond shall be held in the custody of the contracting authority.

37. Interest on security deposits deposited in the Consolidated Revenue Fund accrued up to the end of each fiscal year, or the matured coupons belonging to bonds deposited as security, may be paid or forwarded by the Comptroller to the contractor at the request of the appropriate contracting authority.

38. (1) Where money is received from any person as a deposit to ensure the return to the appropriate contracting authority in good condition of plans and specifications, the contracting authority shall hold the money

(a) In the case of the contractor, until the contract has been awarded whereupon the money shall be returned to the contractor, or

(b) In the case of any person other than the contractor, until the plans and specifications have been returned in a condition and within a time limit satisfactory to the contracting authority, whereupon the money shall be returned to such person.

(2) Where any person described in paragraph (b) of subsection (1) fails to return the plans and specifications in a condition and within a time limit satisfactory to the contracting authority, the contracting authority shall deposit the money, referred to in subsection (1), that was received from such person, to the credit of the Receiver General.

39. Where a payment under a contract has been withheld as a holdback under these Regulations to ensure the due performance of the contract and, pursuant to section 40 of the Financial Administration Act, the payment has been charged to the appropriation for that contract, the amount so charged shall be credited to a special account in the Consolidated Revenue Fund and shall only be paid out from such account in accordance with the contract and these Regulations.

#### APPENDIX

Subparagraphs (i) and (ii) of paragraph (a) of Section 2 of the Financial Administration Act, to which reference is made in subparagraph (i) of paragraph (d) of Section 2 of the Regulations, provide as follows:

"(i) with respect to a department mentioned in subparagraph (i) of paragraph (f) [that is, any of the departments named in Schedule A], the Minister presiding over the department,

"(ii) with respect to any other department, the Minister designated by the Governor in Council as the appropriate Minister."

Schedules A, B, C and D of the Financial Administration Act, as amended, to which reference is made in Section 2 of the Regulations, are as follows:

#### SCHEDULE A.

Department of Agriculture.  
Department of Citizenship and Immigration.  
Department of Defence Production.  
Department of External Affairs.  
Department of Finance.  
Department of Fisheries.  
Department of Insurance.  
Department of Justice.  
Department of Labour.  
Department of Mines and Technical Surveys.  
Department of National Defence.  
Department of National Health and Welfare.  
Department of National Revenue.  
Post Office Department.  
Department of Public Works.  
Department of Public Printing and Stationery.  
Department of Resources and Development.  
Department of the Secretary of State of Canada.  
Department of Trade and Commerce.  
Department of Transport.  
Department of Veterans Affairs.  
Department of Forestry.<sup>3</sup>

#### SCHEDULE B.

Agricultural Prices Support Board.  
Atomic Energy Control Board.  
Canadian Maritime Commission.  
Director of Soldier Settlement.  
The Director, The Veterans' Land Act.  
Dominion Coal Board.  
Fisheries Prices Support Board.  
National Gallery of Canada.  
National Research Council.  
Unemployment Insurance Commission.

#### SCHEDULE C.

Canadian Arsenal Limited.  
Canadian Commercial Corporation.  
Canadian Patents and Development Limited.  
Canadian Sugar Stabilization Corporation Ltd.  
Commodity Prices Stabilization Corporation Ltd.  
Crown Assets Disposal Corporation.  
Defence Construction (1951) Limited.  
Federal District Commission.  
National Battlefields Commission.  
National Harbours Board.

<sup>3</sup> Added by the Department of Forestry Act, 1960 (8-9 Eliz. II, c. 41).

Park Steamship Company Limited.  
Atomic Energy of Canada Limited.<sup>4</sup>

#### SCHEDULE D.

Canadian Broadcasting Corporation.  
Canadian Farm Loan Board.  
Canadian National (West Indies) Steamships, Limited.  
Canadian Overseas Telecommunication Corporation.  
Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation.  
Eldorado Mining and Refining (1944) Limited.  
Export Credits Insurance Corporation.  
National Railways as defined in the Canadian National-Canadian Pacific Act.  
Northern Transportation Company (1947) Limited.  
Northwest Territories Power Commission.  
Polymer Corporation Limited.  
Trans-Canada Air Lines.  
Eldorado Aviation Limited.<sup>5</sup>

#### SCHEDULE B. CANADA

United States Armed Services Procurement Regulation (March 1, 1963)

6-103.5 Canadian Supplies.

(a) Listed: The Secretaries of the Departments have determined that it would be inconsistent with the public interest to apply the restrictions of the Buy American Act with respect to certain supplies, which have been determined to be of a military character or involved in programs of mutual interest to the United States and Canada, where such supplies are mined, produced, or manufactured in Canada and either (i) are Canadian end products offered by the lowest acceptable bid or proposal or (ii) are incorporated in end products manufactured in the United States. Each Department maintains a list of these supplies, which is approved by the Secretary concerned. (The Departmental lists provide that parts and equipment for listed supplies are considered to be included in the lists, even though not separately listed, when they are procured under a contract that also calls for listed supplies.)

(b) Not Listed: The Secretaries of the Departments have also determined that it would be inconsistent with the public interest to apply the restrictions of the Buy American Act (i) to the acquisition of any unlisted Canadian end product that is offered by a bid or proposal which is the lowest acceptable bid or proposal after any applicable duty (whether or not a duty-free entry certificate may be issued) is included for evaluation purposes, and (ii) with respect to any supplies mined, produced, or manufactured in Canada that are incorporated in end products manufactured in the United States.

(c) Application of Canadian Exception: The effect of (a) and (b) above may be summarized as follows.

(1) As to any end product that is manufactured in the United States, all Canadian components are treated as components mined, produced, or manufactured in the United States for the purpose of determining whether the end product is a domestic source end product.

(2) Listed Canadian end products are treated as domestic source end products and neither duty nor the evaluation factors prescribed by 6-104.4 shall be used for evaluation.

(3) Unlisted Canadian end products are evaluated by including any applicable duty, whether or not a duty-free entry certificate may be issued.

(4) Award will not be made for a Canadian end product if there is a lower bid or

<sup>4</sup> Added by Order in Council dated September 15, 1953 (P.C. 1953-1401; SOR/53-382).

<sup>5</sup> Added by Order in Council dated September 15, 1953 (P.C. 1953-1402; SOR/53-383).

proposal which would be acceptable in the absence of the Buy American Act.

(d) Limitations: The above exceptions from the provisions of the Buy American Act which are applicable solely with respect to Canadian supplies, and the special procedures relating thereto which are set forth in this Part, do not apply to, or affect determinations made with respect to, (1) items contained in the list set forth in 6-105, (ii) the purchase of supplies for civil works acquired with funds appropriated for Civil Functions, Department of the Army, or (iii) food items.

#### EFFORT TO BUILD A STRONGER AGRICULTURAL ECONOMY FOR NORTH DAKOTA

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, this morning a group of North Dakotans from both sides of the political aisle began a day of contacts on Capitol Hill to build a stronger agricultural economy for North Dakota. They started this day with a breakfast meeting set up by Senator MILTON R. YOUNG, on the Senate side of our Capitol. MILT YOUNG has worked long, hard, and effectively for not only North Dakota but for our entire Nation, and this was certainly shown clearly when key Members of the Senate—both Republicans and Democrats—gathered at his invitation to be with us and to visit with North Dakotans concerning our problems.

Just last night, in reading the Minot Daily News, I ran across an editorial pointing up a specific example of just one result of his effective service on behalf of all of us. MILT YOUNG indeed serves in the best tradition of America—showing so well our heritage of representative government at its best, and I felt our colleagues would enjoy, as I did, this editorial example of the results he secures:

##### AFTER 19 YEARS—SUCCESS

All North Dakotans share with Senator MILTON R. YOUNG the personal satisfaction he must feel in seeing his efforts materialize for the restoration of Ford's Theater in Washington.

The show house where Abraham Lincoln was shot and fatally wounded by an assassin a hundred years ago is being put back into condition. Great pains are being taken to make its interior look just like it did in 1865. The National Park Service is making it a place that visitors to Washington will want to see.

Senator YOUNG is being given credit for bringing this project to realization through long and patient working, waiting and watching. The senior Senator from North Dakota has considerable influence in Washington today as a ranking Republican.

Probably patience and perseverance are traits that any Senator from North Dakota acquires if he stays long in Washington, and with them Senator YOUNG has mastered the techniques of working with other Senators of both parties for the accomplishment of tasks essentially bipartisan in nature. Most of the problems and interests of North Dakota today are of that character.

For example, the State and both parties have long given support and persistent effort to bring the Garrison diversion project to reality, and that project now stands on its merits at the threshold of authorization. The mills of the Congress grind slowly for many a worthy project, whether it is the creation of a national shrine or a program to make sensible use of the Nation's water resources. And before the Congress can approve construction, a large amount of preparatory investigation, planning, and figuring has to be done. The State of North Dakota and its congressional delegation have been working constantly on Garrison diversion since the Flood Control Act of 1944 was passed.

North Dakotans perhaps more than many other Americans are conscious of the richness of their historical heritage, and want to see sites of national historic importance developed for public appreciation. If Ford's Theater can be restored in complete and accurate detail, the time will come when the Nation will be ready to restore Fort Union Trading Post on the Missouri with equal care. For, as in the case of Ford's Theater, plenty of information exists on what the details of the Fort Union structures were. But first must come the pending step to set aside the Fort Union National Historic Site, an effort on which Senator QUENTIN BURDICK is now working, with unanimous support of the entire congressional delegations of this and other surrounding States.

The day for personal and public satisfaction on these projects, with everyone sharing in the gratification, also will come.

#### THE MYTH OF NO STRINGS ON FEDERAL DOLLARS

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Evening Star has not exactly been in the forefront of those opposing new Federal-aid programs.

It was therefore gratifying to see an editorial last week in the Star which exploded the myth that Federal-aid dollars to schools have no strings attached. Here is the text:

##### THE FEDERAL DOLLAR

When the drive for Federal aid to public education was getting underway there were many assurances that no strings would be attached. Federal aid would not mean Federal interference or control of public schools. That is one myth which has very quickly gone up in smoke.

The Office of Education, headed by Commissioner Francis Keppel, has just announced detailed programs to which all school districts must subscribe if they want to share in the \$1.3 billion which Congress is providing for education. These programs require satisfactory proof of desegregation, which was not required by the Supreme Court's school decision. They also apply to integration of teaching staffs and school transportation. They do not touch curriculums, but there is no reason why this area might not be brought under the Federal arm in future years.

The regulations, drafted by HEW, are said to be based on court decisions, and allegedly are necessary to implement the requirements of title VI of the Civil Rights Act. This

would appear to be correct, although there is some dispute on the point.

What is important now, however, is the illustration that those who want the Federal dollar must be willing to submit to the Federal authority. These rules and regulations, going beyond any court requirement that we know of, will hit hard in the Deep South. Whether officials of school districts in the pinewoods of Alabama or in the Mississippi Delta will comply remains to be seen. It is in these areas that the monetary help is needed most. But the local officials may elect to forgo the dollars rather than yield voluntarily to the Federal demand for integration. But theirs will not be an easy decision. For they must know that if they resist the dollar lure, the Federal courts, in the end, will by one means or another compel them to desegregate their schools.

#### WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE?

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, a fine statement of fundamental American principles was recently presented by Mr. Ward L. Quaal, general manager of WGN, Chicago. It has remarks especially perceptive in regard to American agriculture.

Here is the text of Mr. Quaal's statement, as presented to the Illinois Agricultural Association:

##### WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE?

(By Ward L. Quaal, executive vice president and general manager, WGN, Inc.)

I want to congratulate your president, Henry W. Miller, Jr., your executive vice president, Fred W. Burrows, your other officers and directors and all of the fine members of this organization as the IAA stands on the threshold of its 70th anniversary.

Your association, the oldest association in the United States in the fruit and vegetable field, exemplifies the finest kind of private initiative and enterprise in action—an independently formed group of men and women which through the years has staunchly maintained a policy in opposition to Government subsidy.

If in the course of events, as an organization of Americans, you had done nothing but this, you would have proved your worth to this Nation and deserved the everlasting praise of its people.

But you have done more. You have improved the methods of cultivating the king of fruits, fashioned new and more efficient ways of packaging and merchandising, established standards, developed skilled programs for distribution, and all of this to the benefit of generations of Americans.

In these times of parities and subsidies and supports and other soporifics, it is sometimes difficult to recall the verities of our free enterprise system. You have never forgotten them.

The poignant irony in this is revealed in an item which appeared in the Wall Street Journal less than a month ago.

Here it is in full:

"Apple paradox: Prices edge above last year despite a bumper crop. This year's harvest estimated at 146 million bushels, 20 million above 1963 and the biggest in 27 years. But better storage facilities keep supplies from flooding the market, other fresh

fruit is relatively expensive, and this year's apple crop is exceptionally high in color and quality."

Contrast that story about an industry that does not seek Government subsidy with that reported in *Business Week* last July which stated, in part:

"We cede our role to the Secretary of Agriculture, the cooperatives and to history." On that bitter note, C. Layton Merrit, president of the New Orleans Cotton Exchange, last week rapped a gavel twice to mark the demise of the historic futures trading market."

A big surplus, as *Business Week* reported, held prices down and a support program propped them up, virtually eliminating the need for a futures market—a historic phenomenon of our economic system.

There's a lesson here—the lesson of the apple and cotton. Both are staples of our economy; both are identified with the American scheme, and even glorified in the legends of Johnny Applesed and King Cotton; both are products of the land, diversified in their use and application, reliant upon ingenious methods of manufacture, merchandising, promotion, and distribution.

And yet these reports from two highly respected business periodicals in a 6-month period show one, with surpluses, finding an essential element of its prosperous condition vitiated, and the other with surpluses, prospering.

One virtually untouched by the hand of Government; the other heavily involved.

This pertinent comparison leads one to a contemplation of the whole pattern of politico-economic development which has taken place in this land and in other lands throughout the world during the last three or four decades.

#### SAFETY OF SECURITY IN CONTROLS AT THE TOP?

Have we Americans lost the self-reliance, the self-perception, the self-determination which were our strength and our virtue in the developing world of nations two centuries ago?

Have we turned our hand from the plow to accept the alms of Government?

Have the farmers of this Nation truly secured their future by permitting Government to tell them when they shall sow and when as well as what they shall reap?

Even, now, throughout the Nation, we have uncontrollable stockpiles of wheat, corn, cotton, peanuts, tobacco, and other farm products. They have resulted from a plethora of controls governing price and production.

As soon as government attempts to give to each according to his need, we find the beneficiaries in rebellion.

Why, as Paul L. Poirot asked in the *Freeman*, do people risk their lives at the Berlin wall, seek refuge in Hong Kong from Red China and flee Castro's Cuba to Miami?

Or why did many doctors flee from Britain's National Health Service, or why did businessmen and skilled personnel escape from nationalized industry in droves, or why are there housing shortages in Paris and other places throughout the world where rent control has been imposed by government?

Why does a shortage of food almost inevitably follow agrarian reform?

Is there truly any safety or security in ever-more-stringent controls at the top—or does this indeed smother initiative, thwart ambition and breed indolence?

These are questions, my friends, that all of us must be asking ourselves these days if we are to hand over to coming generations that which was surrendered to us and our fathers—freedom to act, responsibility for our actions, independence of thought and adequate checks against central authority.

What was it that President Eisenhower said to the National Security Council in a moment of understandable frustration:

"Damn it, when are you going to learn that national security and a sound economy are the same thing?"

Our Government by various means is issuing endless promissory notes to the people—unemployment compensation, Treasury bonds, social security, to name a few. But our Government is unable to balance its own budget. We are spending still at a deficit rate, critically expanding the supply of money and credit, risking a perilous devaluation of the dollar.

As that dollar devaluates, your property's value also diminishes.

The warnings for the future are clear and unmistakable despite the prosperous level at which we now are living.

Let me read something to you:

"All communities are apt to look to government for too much. Even in our own country, where its powers and duties are so strictly limited, we are prone to do so, especially at periods of sudden embarrassment and distress. But this ought not to be. The framers of our excellent Constitution and the people who approved it with calm and sagacious deliberation acted at the time on a sounder principle. They wisely judged that the less government interferes with private pursuits the better for the general prosperity."

President Martin Van Buren said that in a special message to Congress on September 4, 1837.

President Van Buren was enunciating a philosophy of government deliberately set forth by some of the most thoughtful Americans who ever lived—Americans who had known and thrown off the yoke of monarchical government.

#### WE ARE ENJOYING ONE OF THE MOST PROSPEROUS PERIODS IN OUR NATION'S HISTORY

Here is a nation that has grown from a population of 4 million at the date of its birth 175 years ago to a population of 193 million today; a nation whose people have been self-sustaining; a nation whose people, drawn from all the places of the earth, have survived war, pestilence and all manner of public calamity; a nation of people whose inheritance is not alone the wealth a unique economy has produced, but more importantly the sturdiness of character handed down by the Founding Fathers.

Can we, in all good conscience, turn our backs on that heritage?

Of course we can't.

And yet we find ourselves today international apologists before the world for the system which has enabled us to create an envied standard of living.

The Communists, for example, have managed to put us on the defensive. None has delineated this circumstance more clearly than Dr. Charles Malik, one-time president of the United Nations General Assembly, now teaching at American University in Washington. Dr. Malik observes:

"[The Communists] make us feel guilty; they talk in terms of capitalism, imperialism, colonialism, monopolies, profits, exploitation, means of production. We usually answer that the exploiting capitalism of the 19th century no longer exists, that imperialism has been liquidated, that monopolies are now owned by the people and that, as to profits, everybody now shares them. There is about this response a pathetic air of apology, a sickly note of timidity and those who make it suffer from a guilty conscience."

It is as if we were bewitched by the sallies of the collectivists, a condition which presents as much logic as Samuel Butler noted when he said: "The hen is an egg's way of producing another egg."

Today we are enjoying one of the most prosperous periods in the history of the Nation. Practically every index by which our economists take the pulse of business conditions indicates continued high employment, increasing production in almost all lines, a relatively stable labor-management relationship in most areas, and a fairly firm price structure. Of course, it's true that the cost of living is pretty high. I don't suppose you can buy an apple for a nickel anymore; can you? But in this respect, I, like Kin Hubbard, haven't heard of anybody who wants to stop living on account of the cost.

There is one disturbing sign that does bear watching. The more generous package settlements in recent labor-management disputes, notably those in the auto industry, reveal increases of 4 to 5 percent in total hourly compensation. This exceeds in some essential industries average annual production gains which have been slightly over 3 percent for the economy. There are long-run inflationary implications here that bear watching, as does the general price level as it affects the consumer.

#### OURS IS MORE THAN A PROFIT SYSTEM

For the last 7 years, there have existed margins of unused manpower and productive facilities which have acted as a natural barrier against a dangerous increase in commodity prices. We are told now that these margins are narrowing—that indeed in some lines of production there are manpower shortages, particularly where skilled labor is required; and it is true that in some areas plant capacities are being fully utilized.

It is in the nature of our kind of economy that prosperity must be nurtured by private enterprise with as much determination as we employ in fighting recession. It is not sufficient to call ours a profit system. It's a profit and loss system and was always intended to preserve competition, not necessarily to preserve competitors. There's risk in the marketplace. There always has been and I trust there always will be. This is what gives zest to our way of enterprise. If that condition ever is supplanted by paternalism whatever its form, then the noble American experiment in living will have ended.

Lord Keynes, analyzing the unsatisfactory condition of his own country in 1931, expressed well this theorem of the interplay of profit, prices and production in a free enterprise economy. He said:

"We live in a society organized in such a way that the activity of production depends on the individual businessman hoping for a reasonable profit, or at least to avoid an actual loss. The margin which he requires as his necessary incentive to produce may be a very small proportion of the total value of the product. But take this away from him and the whole process stops. This, unluckily, is just what has happened. The fall of prices relative to costs, together with the psychological effect of high taxation, has destroyed the necessary incentive to production. This is at the root of our disorganization. It may be unwise, therefore, to frighten the businessman or torment him further."

That was Lord Keynes—foreshadowing the move of his country toward socialism.

#### WHAT CAN WE DO ABOUT IT?

The deterioration in England was caused by neglect. The roots of neglect feed on the soil of complacency. As businessmen, we are fundamentally obligated and should be unrelentingly dedicated to preserving a healthy economy through the profit system. Corporations pay some three-quarters of all nongovernmental wages and salaries. Ergo, if Government is to survive without business—without the taxes paid directly and indirectly by business—then it must leech upon the people themselves, as it does in the totalitarian state.

Government, as was noted in a recent United States Steel annual report, spends money in three major ways: hiring people, buying things privately produced, and paying interest. In recent years, it has increased alarmingly its rate of hiring people and paying interest. This requires Government to seek more funds through taxation and those taxed thus must find, under inflationary conditions, funding sources to keep production rolling. And profits are squeezed.

This is the clarion note of warning all of us here and all businessmen everywhere must heed. What can we do about it?

In the great drama of civilization which has been going on since time out of hand, there are no innocent bystanders. We are all guilty to a certain degree—guilty of missing opportunities, small and large, because we are afraid of ideas; because, if we extend our thoughts beyond the pale of the provincial, we run the risk of offending society.

Collectivism is not a new idea; democracy as we know it, is. Collectivism is feudalism in masquerade. Democracy is an expression of the vitality of people themselves.

Herein we find the secret of what we can do, as business people, to insure forever the strength of the grand plan which all of us esteem.

We can think. We can act. We can have faith. We can stubbornly oppose. And, as important as anything else, we can contrive and invent.

#### WE ARE IN THE MIDST OF A TECHNOLOGICAL REVOLUTION

Einstein's theoretical prediction was made in 1905. It was 38 years before that equation became a reality to the people of the world—all over the world.

Now the time lapse, it has been said by such observers as S. C. Giffillan, between first serious work on an invention and consummation, or the production of a useful article or service, has been reduced from about 50 to about 5 years—and all of this speedup in invention has taken place within the last century.

We are indeed in the midst of a technological revolution.

Now through miniaturization resulting from the development of transistors and printed circuits, compact data processing computers are performing the mathematical calculations in seconds that formerly would have taken 50 people working for weeks. The knowledge of man is being stored in chambers, to be called upon in any of an unpredictable number of combinations at the press of a button.

We and the Soviets, and perhaps soon there will be others, are "punching holes in the heavens," as General Medaris once said, hurling men and machinery into cosmic orbit.

One of the phenomena of our times is the extraordinary launching of Comsat (Communications Satellite Corp.), in a financial sense. The people of this Nation who buy stock—the small investors and the large—apparently believe that anything is possible. And that's the most encouraging omen the world has, whatever the political disposition of her homogenous people. Anything is possible.

All of us have heard the statistics about commodities—that 75 percent of those on the market now were not on the market 50 years ago.

We have witnessed the effects of frozen food on other methods of preserving; we have beheld the vast influence on living induced by the discovery of all manner of plastics and the industrial revolutions caused by the metallurgists employing such substances as beryllium, titanium, and magnesium.

Out in St. Louis, a firm has been successful in demonstrating an automatic bill rejector, as now we have automatic coin rejectors.

This machine can identify and reject counterfeit bills. The next step, of course, will be changemaking.

It is conceivable that such change-making devices, attached to modern electronic thinking machines, will enable the housewife to do her shopping with a punchcard—merely having it punched by a device with the code number of the item she selects, inserting the card when completed in an automatic check-out calculator.

We are living in an economy of interdependence where the delicate balances of distribution, production, merchandising, advertising and selling, and the administrative functions imposed upon all of these activities, can mean the difference between prosperity and depression.

As a result, we are called upon to know more about the specialties of others. We exist in a veritable network of such interdependence: togetherness, you might say, with technological overtones.

We cannot be, therefore, islands unto ourselves, at least not in the contemporary world of business.

We cannot be like Procrustes of Greek mythology. He was a bandit who did not content himself with thievery alone. He would strap victims to his iron bed and if they were too short, he would stretch them on the rack to the desired dimensions. If they were too long, he would lop off their extremities until they fit. For to Procrustes, the standard of perfection was Procrustes himself.

It is quite obvious that those of you gathered here are not Procrustians, or you would not be associated together in an organization which seeks to distill the knowledge of each of you for the benefit of all.

#### STRUGGLE UNCEASINGLY TOWARD THAT PERSONAL GOAL

Twenty-five centuries ago, Sparta—the totalitarian state of that time—was waging war against Athens, which stood for a freer way of life.

The Athenian statesman Pericles, in a funeral oration over the first victims of the war, said:

"The freedom which we enjoy in our government extends to our ordinary way of life. There, far from exercising a jealous surveillance over each other, we do not feel called upon to be angry with our neighbor for doing what he likes \* \* \*"

"If we turn to our military policy, there also we differ from our antagonists. We throw open our city to the world, and never by alien acts exclude foreigners from any opportunity of learning or observing, although the eyes of any enemy may occasionally profit from our liberality. We trust less in system and policy than in the native spirit of our citizens."

How apt are the words of Pericles today in the relationship between the United States and the Soviet States.

If we are to give ultimate lie to the boast of the Soviets that they will outproduce us—if we are to sustain the integrity and the truth of a free enterprise system—then we must know what we're after and get on with it.

One is reminded of the schoolroom experience in which the teacher asked his class of youngsters to draw pictures showing what they wanted to be when they grew up. He received, as you might expect, various renditions of cowboys, space cadets, ballet dancers, singers, policemen, and the like. But one little girl merely gave him a sheet of blank white paper. He asked this girl if she knew what she wanted to be when she grew up.

Yes, she said, she knew. She wanted to be married—but she didn't know how to draw it.

Even if we don't know how to draw it, we should want to be something and to struggle unceasingly toward that personal goal.

That's the essence, friends, of individual action which brings into consonance all of the points and counterpoints of democracy in action.

#### A BROAD CANOPY OF FREEDOM IS NEEDED

What a wonderful opportunity was given to us by our forefathers—by that young Capt. John Parker at Lexington who ordered his little band of recruits, "Stand your ground"; by Paul Revere as he watched the Old North Church tower and prepared to ride from Boston to Lexington; by the Adams and Washingtons and Jeffersons and Franklins and all of their brave company of draftsmen who wrote the Document; by all the others—the young men gone where the crosses mark their passing all over the world, by such as Abraham Lincoln and the grand old man who returned to Iowa just a few days ago and by that sparkling young man who taught us all to look ahead and who was lost to us so tragically just a year ago.

What a wonderful gift, the gift of freedom in a land anointed by the toll of faithful millions.

Baltasar Gracian said, "Freedom is more precious than any gifts for which you may be tempted to give it up."

In all of the fascinating developments of the era—the grander automobiles, the more convenient shelters, the extraordinary growth in communications and transportation—in this time when highways are wider, trains are superstreamlined, pictures flash through the air, and astronauts drift above us—one entity remains constant. Man himself. No new model has been announced for this year.

With his busy mind and his busy hands, man is creating miracles daily, but none that matches the miracle of himself. But man cannot sustain his present state, nor indeed soar to new heights, without the broad canopy of freedom that gives him movement and opportunity and inspiration.

I say to you again that your determination to operate under that canopy in the traditional fashion of our free economy is itself a matter of the highest public interest.

I believe firmly that in a climate of such freedom—not such freedom as the law will allow, but such freedom as the law has the right to take away—our opportunities for happiness and peace in the world of tomorrow will multiply.

The promise to our children will be fulfilled just as the one made to us has been fulfilled by all of the proud people who preceded us to this green and lovely land.

#### MICHIGAN FARM LABOR CRISIS

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CEDERBERG] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, while the strawberry crop in California rots on the ground for want of pickers, Michigan cucumber growers are faced with a decision of abandoning plans for this year's crop for the same reason.

In many areas of the country farmers are confronted with a crisis due to lack of adequate labor supply because of the policy of the Department of Labor. It is the position of the Department of Labor that an adequate supply of domestic

labor can be recruited from the unemployment rolls. The facts are that the average unemployed person, unaccustomed to stoop labor, will just not hold out on the job in the picklefields.

I have twice appealed to the Secretary of Labor for some assurance that labor will be available for Michigan pickle growers. This is another instance where the wheels of Government grind too slowly where Mother Nature is involved. I should here point out that the State of Michigan produces more cucumbers for pickling than any other State in the country. Last year, Michigan produced 115,140 tons of cucumbers which was twice the amount produced by any other State.

If Michigan pickle farmers cannot get some assurance of a labor supply within a matter of days, they tell me they will abandon pickles as a crop and turn to some other commodity. This will not only add to existing surpluses but will create unemployment in the pickle processing plants.

As an indication of the deep concern in my district, I have received the following resolution from the Montcalm County Board of Supervisors:

Whereas the economy of Montcalm County, Mich., is based predominantly on agricultural production, and

Whereas the harvesting of many of its crops, especially potatoes and pickles, is dependent in large part on manual labor supplied by migrant workers from Mexico, and

Whereas recent changes in treaties with Mexico have caused much uncertainty making contracting for labor during the coming harvest season difficult, if not impossible, and

Whereas this uncertainty and lack of labor contracts are causing a great hardship on local and State farmers and the farm economy: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Montcalm County Board of Supervisors expresses its deep concern regarding the present farm labor situation to W. Willard Wirtz, PATRICK V. McNAMARA, PHILIP HART, President Johnson, Governor Romney, and ELFORD CEDERBERG; and be it further

*Resolved*, That these gentlemen be requested to do all within their power to correct this problem by making available an adequate supply of suitable farm labor which is necessary for the farm economy of Montcalm County and rural Michigan.

NYLE B. ERSKIN,  
County Clerk.

In the city of Carson City, Mich., businessmen and officials of local governing agencies have been encouraged over expansion plans for a local pickle processing plant. This company employs over 150 people and, in addition, bolsters the economy of the farming community by contracting with area farmers for the purchase of their cucumbers. Now the plant may be compelled to abandon its expansion plans if an inadequate supply of cucumbers is available. It is estimated that 2,500 workers are needed for work in the cucumber farms in this area.

Mayor Herschel Haradine, of Carson City, has telephoned me about this crisis. He has also sent me a letter revealing how important it is to his community to have laborers available for this crop year.

His letter follows:

CITY OF CARSON CITY, MICH.,  
April 28, 1965.

HON. AL CEDERBERG,  
Congressman, 10th District of Michigan,  
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CEDERBERG: Am writing to confirm our conversation with your secretary Tuesday afternoon regarding an emergency situation in our local pickle industry.

With the planting season fast approaching, our cucumber-producing farmers are refusing to sign contracts because of the fear of a shortage of harvest labor. Acreage planned for cucumber production will be reverted to beans and corn, very productive crops in our area. A situation that I am sure the farm administration and bean-growing areas fear. The cucumber processing plant of Vlasic Food Products has been making big plans for expansion for their Carson City plant. They now indicate they cannot go through with these plans if the Labor Department insists on depriving this area of the Mexican nationals who have been harvesting the crop. There simply are not enough domestic laborers who will accept this work.

We in Carson City and surrounding farming area are very much disturbed. The economic effect of the loss of this plant aside from the year-around investment has been estimated at \$18,140 per week for each of the approximately 7 weeks of harvest, or total of \$126,980. This is for labor only. The amount paid to growers is slightly under \$200,000. The plant payroll with 164 employees for the season last year was about \$68,400 with an additional \$36,000 to regular year-around employees. This \$104,400 payroll in itself represents a large contribution to our community for the year.

The location of the plant in our community already contributes greatly to the assessed valuation of our school district, and planned further expansion will give the other local taxpayers and homeowners even greater assistance in providing for our educational needs.

Mr. Leo Jokel, vice president and manager of the Vlasic's Carson City plant tells us they will need at least 2,500 workers if they are to obtain the 25-percent increase in acreage they had planned. Right now it appears that there will be no increased acreage but rather a 50-percent cut in last year's acreage.

We would welcome a call from you if there is any further information you might need in petitioning Mr. Wirtz for relief in this emergency. And we stress the emergency because farmers must be assured now within the next few days that sufficient harvest help will be available or they will simply plant some other crop.

Yours very truly,

HERSCHEL HARADINE,  
Mayor, City of Carson City.

I sincerely hope that the Department will not further delay reaching a decision on the Michigan situation. Planting time has arrived and Michigan farmers are impatient over the delays. If assurance of an adequate labor supply is not forthcoming they will plant their fields in other crops.

ADDRESS BY CONGRESSMAN GERALD R. FORD TO THE YALE LAW SCHOOL ALUMNI ASSOCIATION

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD] may extend his remarks at

this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, on April 30, the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GERALD R. FORD] addressed the Yale University Law School alumni association.

In his words to his fellow alumni, our colleague outlined ably and understandably the role not only of the minority party in Congress, but also the place and perspective of each branch of our Government and its relationship to the others.

His theme was responsibility—the responsibility of the individual toward his Government, the responsibility of each of us in Government toward our fellow citizens and the responsibility of each separate branch of the Government toward the whole fabric of our Government and our constitutional objectives.

Because I believe these words deserve the close consideration of my colleagues, regardless of political affiliation, the address by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GERALD R. FORD] follows:

ADDRESS BY REPRESENTATIVE GERALD R. FORD, YALE LAW SCHOOL ALUMNI DINNER, APRIL 30, 1965

When Governor Scranton was here last year he said he would talk on a "safe subject"—politics. Being a peaceful man myself, and wishing to avoid controversy whenever possible, I, too, will stick to that safe subject.

But as House minority leader in the so-called age of consensus, I do have some ready views in the matter of differences of opinion and dissent in 1965 America.

Difference of opinion does make for horse-races—but for a republic to survive, something greater is required of its citizens. Our need is for responsible dissent.

In the Nation's Capital, we of the Republican Party recognize the necessity of informed and responsible opposition to Johnson administration programs. And we mean to fulfill our function as the party of opposition in a constructive and responsible manner.

But briefly let me address my remarks beyond the Capitol Hill scene. For we must all recognize a growing threat posed to our society and the country by irresponsible expressions of dissent in this time of national crisis.

I refer to the crisis in southeast Asia. It should be sufficient that our Nation's enemies know that the overwhelming majority of Republicans in Congress, though opposed to many of the President's domestic programs, support him in the matter of standing firm against aggression in Vietnam. In fact, it is worth commenting that President Johnson might wish for an equal amount of support for his Vietnam stand from members of his own Democratic Party.

I consider it incredible that a source of such irresponsible modern-day know-nothing dissent based on emotional disregard for the morality and facts of the case should spring from a few of our university campuses.

And I consider it appalling that much of the leadership for picketing with anti-American slogans in what at times amounts to irresponsible mob action comes from a small



minority of university professors purporting to carry forward the banner of free academic inquiry.

Indeed, a central purpose of universities of free inquiry in our society is to prepare succeeding generations for the assumption of responsibility as citizens. Whenever our educational institutions fail to inculcate this sense of responsibility toward community and Nation in their students, serious trouble for the Republic lies ahead.

This has been the case throughout history. This century offers tragic proof of the penalties which societies and nations pay for not meeting this fundamental requirement for existence.

During the recent Easter weekend demonstrations in Washington, some placards read: "Why Die for Vietnam?"

How many of us remember the similar question raised by irresponsible voices in Chamberlain's Britain, little over a quarter century ago: "Why Die for the Sudetenland?" and "Why Die for Danzig?"

We know now—and many of us did then—that these pacifist voices were serving the purposes of Nazi aggression. The placard-bearers cried for peace—while the seeds for Buchenwald and Belsen were taking root.

Today, our so-called teach-ins and peace demonstrations cry for peace-at-any-price—while the seeds of Communist atrocity take root. And yet the appeasers speak of morality.

Others are concerned with the physical uncleanness of these irresponsible protesters. I am not so much concerned with their personal hygiene as with their moral sterility. For if we condemn public apathy toward victims of street crimes, what can we say of apathy and disinterest regarding victims of Communist aggression?

It is, of course, an apathy and disinterest shown only by a small, small minority of American professors and students. The so-called teach-ins—which I regret to say may have begun at my own University of Michigan—are not truly representative of the Nation's university campuses. However, it remains for responsible leaders of American higher education to make this fact unmistakably clear to our people.

The well intentioned but unrealistic placard-carrying marchers who bear no public responsibilities cannot alter this country's policy in Vietnam. But a danger exists that they will bring about a damaging loss of public confidence in the aims and operation of the country's educational system. In addition their words and actions may lead to a dangerous miscalculation by the enemy of our Nation's course of present and future action. Such miscalculation by the Communists in Peiping or elsewhere could have dire consequences for all mankind.

Certainly there must always be a place for responsible dissent and free inquiry on our university campuses. But, as President Nabrit, of Howard University, pointed out this past week, there is no place for irresponsible disruption of academic pursuits on behalf of forces opposed to our system.

Dr. Wilson H. Elkins, president of the University of Maryland, expressed a similar idea saying that respect of students for authority and law is essential to the development of good citizenship and the "insidious erosion and sometimes outright defiance of authority is a dangerous trend in our society."

Dr. Elkins added: "It seems clear that if any student or group \* \* \* is allowed to seize power in the name of freedom of speech, then the universities should close their doors before rigor mortis sets in."

It is not too much to expect university students to understand that along with free academic inquiry goes responsibility to country and society. And it is certainly not too much to expect their professors to know and teach that the prime master of free inquiry

in Western society did not walk the streets of Athens carrying a placard asking "Why Die for Marathon?" when his community was threatened.

Indeed, Socrates knew the answer. He was prepared to do battle and if necessary die to preserve the freedom of others \* \* \* yet my main thesis tonight is the need for responsible dissent in the age of consensus.

In the years ahead, as never before, we must beware of men with ready answers.

For we will still have to live—and find answers—under moral ground rules that were set down 20 centuries ago and under political ground rules that were set down 2 centuries ago.

Leaving the former to the theologians, I would like to make some comments on the latter.

The American Constitution was not divinely created. The Founding Fathers, after all, were merely mortals—why four of them were even Yale men. (Harvard had only three. Though we must admit that nine came from Princeton.)

The important point to stress when discussing the Constitution, I believe, is not that it has been sanctified by time and tradition. Nor need we dwell on its immutability—it can and has been changed from time to time. What is important is that it works. We have lived successfully and amicably under it. In a society that has always prided itself on pragmatism this is the ultimate test.

The keystone of our Constitution has been its system of balances—balances between levels of government and balances between branches of government.

Anyone who has ever worked with balances in a scientific laboratory knows that they are finely attuned instruments. One must be constantly alert to keep them in kilter; one must make immediate adjustments when there is a malfunction. Our governmental balances are no different in principle.

The legislative-executive-judicial balance, as established by our Constitution is a simple, yet ingenious, system of insuring our freedom.

Yet today there are disturbing signs of slow erosion in the power of the legislative, build-up of awesome power in the executive, and regrettable change in the intended direction of the judiciary. Each is a threat to freedom.

I think that much of today's criticism of Congress, the legislative branch, is a manifestation of our frustrations—the tensions of a prolonged cold war, the anomaly of poverty in the midst of plenty, the complexity of highly urbanized living, the gap between the American ideal of equality and its realization.

"Let's stop talking and get things done," we would all like to shout at one time or another.

But Congress, by design, is a deliberative body—435 Representatives in the House and 100 in the Senate who must reach majority decisions.

This criticism—that Congress is too cumbersome, too old fashioned—is basically unwarranted for two reasons.

First, because Congress has repeatedly proved that it can act with dispatch to meet crisis. You will recall, for example, that in the famous hundred days of 1933 some bills were voted into law even before they were printed.

Second, because the advantages of precipitous action are often outweighed by the safeguards of deliberate slowness.

In the race to the brink of decision one can easily fall over into the chasm of irresponsibility. It is to prevent this dangerous plunge that the Constitution provided checks and balances. It is only proper, when one stops to consider, that Congress should reach its major decisions after adequate research, thought, and full discussion.

After all, if the ultimate goal of government were merely speed, we could institute a dictatorship. What could be faster than one man giving an uncontested order?

When the balance in Congress is steeply tilted by an overwhelming majority in one political party—as it is today with 294 Democrats and 140 Republicans in the House—our system of checks and balances is further endangered.

This is because our two-party system, although not written into the Constitution, builds into government an additional set of checks and balances. Early in our history a wise decision was made to follow the pattern of a two-party system. We avoided the loss of freedom of a one-party government; we avoided the chaos and confusion of a multiparty government.

Not only does a strong second party provide the electorate with legislative alternatives but also with a remarkably high level of honesty and frankness.

Without indulging in partisanship, I am sure we can all agree that a strong two-party system is democracy's life insurance—protection for our children against any drift toward authoritarianism. Conversely, a crushing overbalance of strength in either party for too long will make a mockery of our traditions in government and weaken the voice of the people.

This threat to the American system becomes even more serious when both legislative and executive branches are dominated by the same party.

The temptation for the President's majority in Congress to simply rubberstamp his proposals can become irresistible. Especially when the President is a master at the art of arm twisting—or, as the present incumbent calls it, "reasoning together." The recently passed Education Act is a case in point. We had such quick passage of a bill without Congress really working its will that many conscientious citizens feel raised more questions than answers. So we now hear talk of correcting the flaws with additional legislation. But this is hardly an adequate substitute for well-thought-out action.

We must also remember that the burgeoning growth of big government has given the President virtually unlimited resources for working his will. Besides the increased patronage and the increased leverage of administering massive spending programs, he now controls a veritable army of experts, researchers and propagandists whose job it is to present his administration in the best possible light to the American people.

Great power in a democracy should require great self-restraint. Yet only 2 weeks ago we were dramatically reminded that this is not always the case. I am referring to April 15—the day of reckoning for the American taxpayer. An incalculable number of citizens were then obliged to go into debt as a delayed result of Federal tax legislation with political overtones. What happened was that after the 1964 tax reduction was passed the administration wished to bask in the sun of voter gratitude, while muting the politically disagreeable fact that cutting the withholding tax would leave the taxpayer with a larger cash obligation to the Treasury on April 15, 1965, than in previous years. The administration's action—in allowing a false impression to exist—reminded Columnist Arthur Krock of a television commercial that used fake sandpaper in a shaving cream demonstration. But in the case of the commercial fakery, the Federal Trade Commission ordered the company to cease and desist. Nobody, however, required the administration to do likewise.

Today the President is kingpin of the branch of Government that employs over 5

million civilian and military personnel, with a yearly payroll cost of \$28 billion, and a total expenditure of over 127 billion tax dollars in fiscal 1966.

This is awesome power, indeed. And if consistently used improperly could mean the withering away of our tripartite system of government and the eventual death of the two-party system.

It is also necessary to remember that while the President is Chief Executive of all of us, he basically represents the views of only those who voted for him. (Many times this has meant less than a majority of the people.)

On the other hand, Members of Congress, and particularly those in the House of Representatives, are closer to the Nation's citizens. They are chosen by smaller segments of the Nation. In the House they are elected every 2 years. They represent every section of the country, rural and city, suburbs, blue-collar and white-collar, every major profession, doctors and lawyers, nearly every national origin, Protestant, Catholic, Jew, Negro, even American Indian.

This is your strength. It should not be diluted by an overbalance in the executive and judicial branches of Government.

While it is the duty of the legislative branch to enact laws, and the duty of the executive branch to administer laws, it is the duty of the third branch of Government, the judiciary, to interpret the laws.

Unfortunately there is evidence that the judicial branch is now arbitrarily elbowing its way into new positions of authority, and disregarding the wise suggestion of judicial restraint made by the late Justice Frankfurter and others.

When the Supreme Court ordered the States to reapportion on the "one-man, one-vote" concept, Justice Frankfurter, in a dissenting opinion, was critical of an assumption by the Court of "destructively novel judicial power."

"In this situation, as in others of like nature," Justice Frankfurter said, "appeal for relief does not belong here. Appeal must be made to an informed, civically militant electorate. In a democratic society like ours," he continued, "relief must come through an aroused public conscience that sears the conscience of the people's representatives."

Justice Frankfurter emphasized that the "Supreme Court's authority—possessed neither of the purse nor the sword—ultimately rests on sustained public confidence in its moral sanction."

It seems to me that the major goals to be sought in the area of government are twofold. First: a sensitive balance between executive, legislative and judicial branches; second: a strong two-party system.

As the goals are simple and straightforward, so, too, are the means of reaching them: a renewed sense of citizen participation at all levels of government; alert, enlightened and unfettered news media; self-restraint by those in positions of public trust; a general understanding of the workings of the American governmental system, so as to be able to detect deviations from it; and, above all, constant vigilance.

#### GEN. MILAN STEFANIK

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, today we pause in memory of the tragic

death of Gen. Milan Stefanik, who certainly would have been a major figure in any nation. It is one of the tragedies of history that he was only able to claim a nation as his own for just a few years prior to his death.

General Stefanik was born in Slovakia, which was under foreign domination then as it is now. He was raised in a scholarly atmosphere and received his degree as doctor of philosophy from Charles University in Prague. Stefanik went to France in 1902 to live in freedom and after years of struggle he achieved great distinction as an astronomer and did valuable research in Africa, the Americas, Europe, and the South Seas.

General Stefanik became a naturalized French citizen and joined the French Air Force in 1914 when war came to Europe. His distinguished record resulted in him receiving new honors, and he attained the rank of major general. He joined in the Czechoslovakia National Council with Edouard Benes and Thomas G. Masaryk. The independent State of Czechoslovakia grew out of this Council, and Stefanik became Minister of War. He was killed when his plane crashed on landing at Bratislava on May 4, 1919, where he was returning from a conference in Italy. In his tragic and untimely death, the Czechoslovak Republic suffered an irreparable loss of its most gallant and gifted soldier.

On the occasion of the 46th anniversary of his death, I am honored to join my Czechoslovak friends in paying tribute to the memory of this distinguished leader of his people and gallant fighter for freedom and democracy.

#### NEW HAMPSHIRE SENATE CON- DEMNS ADMINISTRATION FIRE- ARMS BILL

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, the subject of gun legislation is of deep concern to citizens of New Hampshire. Hundreds of my constituents, sportsmen, collectors, dealers, and other citizens, have written and spoken to me about it. They are opposed to the stringent provisions of the administration's bill, S. 1592, introduced March 22 by the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD]. So am I. While it is generally agreed that some new controls over mail-order weapons may be in order, the administration's bill goes too far. It does not merely restrict the commercial traffic in hand guns and concealed weapons, it would outlaw all mail-order traffic to individuals.

The feeling that this is far too drastic a measure is reflected in the recent action of the Senate of New Hampshire in adopting resolutions of opposition to S. 1592. For 12 years I was privileged to be a member of the State senate and I sub-

mit these resolutions for the Record with approbation. I congratulate the senate for this forthright stand and hope this expression of sentiment will help to alert the House to the feelings of the country on this legislation:

Resolution relative to control of firearms

Whereas there is an increasing agitation in Washington to pass bills to control the ownership and use of firearms, which are cardinal rights of citizens of the United States; and

Whereas a new bill has been introduced into the U.S. Senate by Senator THOMAS J. DODD, of Connecticut (S. 1592) which would prohibit all mail order sales of firearms to individuals, and permits such sales only between licensed importers, manufacturers and dealers, and places such severe and unreasonable restrictions upon reputable citizens who wish to order recreational firearms by mail; and

Whereas this bill, if passed and written into law, would give the Secretary of the Treasury, or his agent, virtually unlimited authority to regulate the sale of firearms by dealers which could result in the institution of stringent controls and prohibitions over such sales; and

Whereas the Founders of the United States in the very first amendment to the Constitution provided assurances for freedom of religion, of speech, of the press, and of peaceable assembly and in the second amendment they made it possible to defend these freedoms by providing that the rights of people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed; and

Whereas any firearms legislation at the Federal level restricting the purchase of firearms by responsible citizens would be a dangerous infringement of these articles of the Bill of Rights and which could lead to administrative decisions imposing such a burden on the sale, possession, and use of firearms for legitimate purposes as to completely discourage and eventually exclude the private ownership of all guns; and

Whereas such restrictive regulations as contained in the Dodd bill against firearms sales could have a crippling effect on the economy of the multimillion-dollar-a-year sales and services business associated with recreational use of firearms in the State of New Hampshire, and would only result in further loss of American liberty, add to the workload of our law enforcement and police forces, and inconvenience and penalize law abiding citizens; and

Whereas Federal excise taxes on sales of firearms and other forms of revenue from special licenses and stamps for recreational hunting provide many millions of dollars annually for the conservation and preservation of wildlife of all kinds; and

Whereas caution and prudence must be observed to protect the constitutional rights of the law abiding citizen from the possibility that legislating against the delinquent and the criminal does not result in legislating against the citizen of good repute: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the ownership of firearms must not be denied reputable American citizens so long as they continue to use them for lawful purposes; and be it further

*Resolved*, That easy accessibility of firearms does not contribute significantly to the crime problem of the United States, and that the target for preventive legislation should be the crime, not the tool used by perpetrators of crimes, and that the members of the New Hampshire Senate go on record as opposing passage of the Dodd bill, which appears to be aimed at outlawing firearms rather than punishing the criminal who uses them for illegal purposes and, this Dodd bill could seriously impair the recreational economy of the State and Nation, infringe on the Constitutional rights of U.S. citizens, damage

essential wildlife conservation programs, and intrude further Federal authority on powers reserved to the States; and be it further

*Resolved*, That any proposed new regulations should be studied carefully to see if they can accomplish a worthwhile purpose and not just result in further regimentation and inconvenience to responsible citizens; and be it further

*Resolved*, That the clerk of the senate be instructed to forward copies of these resolutions to the members of the New Hampshire congressional delegation.

#### A RECORD VOTE FOR H.R. 7765

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RUMSFELD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 7765, which has just passed the House, provides for 1966 fiscal year appropriations of \$7,964,034,000 for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies. Because this important measure passed the House by a voice vote, I wish to record my support for H.R. 7765.

Further, I must state, as I have on a number of previous occasions, my strong disapproval of the technique of passing major bills—this one costing close to \$8 billion—without a record vote. The public's business should be conducted in public and the House does itself disservice when it fails to require record votes on major bills, thereby denying the people of this Nation information on how their Representatives voted.

#### NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS— PART LVIII

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article from the March 15, 1965, edition of the New York Herald Tribune.

The article concerns the program to assist high school dropouts in New York City and is part of the series on "New York City in Crisis."

The article follows:

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Mar. 15, 1965]

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS—FOR JOIN: A SLOWLY GROWING ACCEPTANCE

(By Sue Reinert, of the Herald Tribune staff)

In July 1963, Mayor Wagner and Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz held a joint press conference to announce a new program for unemployed, untrained high school dropouts—job orientation in neighborhoods.

The crux of the JOIN program was that instead of forcing the needy to come to the city for help, the city was going to go to the

needy, right in their neighborhoods. Ten neighborhood centers would be opened to provide counseling, training, and placement for the jobless youths. Twenty thousand youths would be served in 15 months. The Federal Government would give \$2 million to the program and the city \$1 million.

"The program," said Secretary Wirtz, "tells them [jobless youths] things are going to be different. And I believe that they are."

As of January 31, 1965—18 months after the program was announced—10,145 youths had been accepted for the JOIN program. The number of placements was 2,830—a total that does not accurately reflect the number of persons placed in jobs because some JOIN youths have been placed several times. A JOIN study showed that only 40 to 45 percent of its youngsters remained on the jobs where they were placed.

The goal of 20,000 youths—so widely announced—was reduced to 8,000 in mid-1964 without the benefit of a press release. Federal money did not come in at the promised rate. When the Federal grant for JOIN ran out at the end of last month, Washington had paid only about \$780,000 to the program, although a spokesman in the Department of Labor said there were unpaid vouchers waiting for processing.

It was the city that bore the heaviest financial burden. The first \$1 million in 1963 was supplemented by another \$1 million for the fiscal year 1964-65; and the mayor just approved another supplement of \$280,000 for JOIN this year.

#### OPERATION SUCCESSFUL

Eight instead of ten centers were opened. The first opened in January 1964, instead of October 1963, as had been promised. The last, in Staten Island, opened last month.

David Jones, former deputy commissioner of correction and now the director of the JOIN program, says that JOIN has been "reasonably successful."

"It's not been a grand success," Mr. Jones said, "But of all the OMAT (Office of Manpower and Training of the Department of Labor) programs, it's been the only one attempting to work with large numbers of youngsters. We accepted all. We had to be innovative because the counselor staff is not sizable. (The professional staff totals 66-55 counselors, six testers, and five psychologists). We learned how to deal with these youngsters on a mass basis."

Mr. Jones said the reluctance of Federal officials to support the JOIN program stemmed from a difference of opinion between Washington and New York over what kind of people should direct JOIN centers. The Federal people wanted professionals; the city insisted on nonprofessionals who were "indigenous to the community."

The idea of having nonprofessionals run the JOIN centers was the work of Julius C. C. Edelstein, Mayor Wagner's executive assistant and the city official responsible for the JOIN program. Mr. Edelstein interviewed each applicant for the position of center director, which pays \$10,000 to \$11,000 a year.

To some observers this looked like an effort to put politics into the JOIN program, but Mr. Edelstein and Mr. Jones say it was done in order to provide community support for the program and thus to draw more youngsters to the JOIN centers. "The biggest intake was where we had the best community support," says Mr. Edelstein, "in East Harlem." (The East Harlem center was also the first to open.)

And whatever might have been suspected, the six directors who are now in office have no direct connection with politics. Some have worked for the city, almost all have been leaders in community or civil rights groups. One, Celia Vice, director of a Brooklyn JOIN Center, once was reportedly considering running for district leadership, but she was never elected.

What about the original JOIN goal of helping 20,000 youths? "There was no experience to go on," said Mr. Jones. "The other thing that wasn't anticipated was that it's a hard thing to set up a program in a city of the complexity of New York City. It soon became apparent to us that 20,000 was impossible."

Didn't reducing the goal bolster the cynicism of many slum youths who look upon city programs as empty gestures? "There was no effect on the youngsters," said Mr. Jones. "We didn't make any public announcement."

Mr. Edelstein considers the JOIN program so far a "learning experience." The city he says, has learned that such programs must include "employment at the end of the line" as an "incentive," and must be neighborhood-based.

Also, he says, "We've learned that you can't take these kids off the street and put them to work. Even after we've given them counseling and motivation, they still have to have the experience of sheltered work." Sheltered work? "The kind where they are not called upon to perform at the same level of output as they would be if they had to justify their employment economically to the employer," said Mr. Edelstein.

"Some people said these are political appointments," said Mr. Jones. "But the center directors are just people who have exerted some leadership in the community."

"This doesn't harm the program at all. City hall sees things that I couldn't possibly see—that's why Mr. Edelstein interviews applicants."

"Besides," said Mr. Jones, "Mr. Edelstein would be just as anxious as he to make good appointments, because city hall has got to have a successful program to rebound to the credit of city hall."

At the level of the individual center, the problems of policy and Federal support are not a matter of concern. Frank Di Bernardo, a counselor at the Corona JOIN Center in Queens, worries about the kids.

"These kids feel a kind of helpless passivity in the face of very rapid change," he says. "A lot of kids come in here and just sit there at first. This is due to weeks, months of inaction. The counselor tries to give the kid action—to make him change from being passive and just waiting for things to happen to him."

The 55 counselors in JOIN centers are required to hold master's degrees in vocational counseling or a related field and to have at least 1 year of experience. Twenty-four of them have at least 3 years of experience, and 13 are senior counselors with at least 5 years. The testers must have a master's degree in clinical psychology and experience in working with tests, and the psychologists—some of whom double as testers—must have a doctorate in psychology.

The director of the Corona center is Leroy Carter, a 56-year-old Negro who was an officer of the local NAACP and a senior staff member of the city commission on human rights. Mr. Carter also is acting director of another JOIN center in South Jamaica.

At the Jamaica center one recent morning, a dozen young men and women were waiting to be processed. Most looked distrustful of the whole business. In a small cubicle office, Miss Mona Shub, the center's placement officer, said she had seen "real change" in the youth who came to the center.

"When I first came here," she said, "I would make 37 referrals—maybe 10 would show. Now I send 37 and 37 show. The youngsters are growing up a little."

Miss Shub said one of the persistent difficulties in helping the neighborhood youths was that many of them had police records and were hard to place. "In this particular neighborhood," she said, "a policeman picks up a kid for disorderly conduct, he fingerprints him and, bang, he's got a record. In

a middle-class neighborhood, I don't believe a policeman would do that. \* \* \* But if these kids can prove themselves in on-the-job training programs, I have been able to break down some employers who wouldn't accept kids with records previously."

The JOIN staff at both centers is extremely pleased with the new Neighborhood Youth Corps program, under which 5,400 youths will be employed part-time at city agencies and nonprofit institutions. The corps will take younger teenagers—from 16 to 18—who are difficult to place with private employers, and will also take the youngsters with records. "It's a Godsend," said Wistor Smith, head counselor at Jamaica. "These kids will have some experience to point to after 5 months in a youth corps job."

Some of the Jamaica JOIN center applicants who have already been placed in the youth corps program are working in the Jamaica YMCA. Five young men are working as maintenance men, cafeteria busboys, messengers, information clerks, and game room attendants. Three women are typists and clerks.

Mrs. Grace Madden, the YMCA office manager, said the JOIN youths were doing a "splendid job." Sandra Jones, 18, one of the typists, had never held a job before. Mrs. Eileen Johnson, 20, had worked briefly for a friend, and Sharelle Davenport, 20, had gone through a training program in the city, department of personnel.

One of the criticisms of programs like JOIN and the youth corps is that the jobs that youths are placed in are often menial and offer no opportunity for advancement. Mrs. Johnson, Miss Davenport and Miss Jones do not bear out that criticism. Each was asked what she would like to work at after the 5-month youth corps job was finished.

"Clerical, that's what I like," said Miss Davenport, a clerk.

"I'd like the same type of job I have now," said Mrs. Johnson, also a clerk.

In addition to providing jobs for JOIN youths, the Neighborhood Youth Corps program will also provide Federal money for the JOIN program—despite the fact that Federal officials in OMAT appeared reluctant to support the program. The money will be provided through a formula that allots one counselor to every 60 youths in the youth corps program.

This works out to considerable support. According to Henry Rosner, assistant to the Commissioner of Welfare and head of the Neighborhood Youth Corps program, JOIN has been allotted 64 percent of the youth corps placements—3,456 out of 5,400.

#### NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS—PART LIX

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULDER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULDER. Mr. Speaker, the following article discusses the opinion of one of the country's leading human renewal experts about the responsibility for New York City's economic and social problems.

The article appeared in the March 16, 1965, edition of the New York Herald Tribune and is part of the series on "New York City in Crisis."

#### The article follows:

#### NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS—BUSINESS LEADERS BLAMED FOR CITY'S CRISES

(By Barry Gottehrer, of the Herald Tribune staff)

One of the Nation's top urban experts yesterday blamed the business leadership of New York for the city's growing crises.

"The business community of New York knows how to manage the most productive economy in the world, but they can't keep their own streets clean," said Edward J. Logue, development administrator of Boston and one of the pioneers in human renewal as opposed to slum clearance.

"They complain about New York's problems but they don't do anything about it," he went on. "New York doesn't need any more committees or special commissions. New York City needs a commitment by its business leaders. Businessmen have to become involved. They have to become partners."

"I know of no major city in the world—except possibly Calcutta—where the business leadership is less involved—is more needed—and local government than they are in New York."

Mr. Logue, who helped pioneer the concept of human renewal in New Haven under Mayor Richard C. Lee before moving to Boston in 1961, delivered his indictment of New York's business community as guest speaker at the annual Pard Award luncheon in New York yesterday.

He did not, however, limit his criticism to the businessmen at the luncheon or during an interview immediately following it.

"It is time New York City stopped blaming public officials and started looking at the system itself," he said. "It is a mistake if we think that New York City is governed today under a charter. It is governed by Parkinson's law \* \* \*."

The best government is one you can reach and touch and feel. New York City's urban-renewal program and everything else won't work if the officials can't reach and touch the citizens and the citizens can't reach out and touch you."

#### FASHIONABLE TO BLAME MAYOR

Conceding that "it has become very fashionable today to blame Mayor Wagner for all of the city's problems," Mr. Logue, 44, a Democrat, felt that the mayor of New York was a man handicapped both by the system and by the city's size.

"It's possible to do a good job as mayor of Binghamton," he said. "I'm not sure it's possible to do a good job in New York. One of the best things for New York City to do is to boost Binghamton. Maybe some of the people will move then."

Unlike a great many public officials, who prefer to ignore the city's problems while discussing the difficulties of governing a city of 8 million, Mr. Logue tackled the problems of the city head-on.

"New York is dirtier, it's less attractive, it's a lot less safe, the air is more polluted and the traffic is no worse—only because it couldn't get any worse than it used to be," he said. "It's a sad feeling coming in here by plane and seeing all that pollution hanging up there over the city. Sure the problems are great, but New York is supposed to be a leader, not a follower."

As a start, Mr. Logue offered several possible suggestions—beginning with a firm commitment by business leaders and a realization that "they are at least in part responsible for the nightmare the city is becoming."

"The President asked for \$750 million in construction for the entire country," he said. "To get New York housing going again, it would probably require all of the \$750 million."

Short of this immediate financial commitment, Mr. Logue recommended a consolidation of New York's housing and planning arms in an attempt to cut through a maze of bureaucracy that is strangling the city and preventing progress.

In Boston—as in Philadelphia and a few other cities the planning and urban-renewal departments are consolidated—cutting red-tape, eliminating bureaucracy and speeding up construction.

In New York, the planning commission is still responsible for designating a site for urban renewal while the housing and redevelopment board is still in charge of carrying the program on from there.

In New York, this system has led to over-optimistic predictions, interdepartmental sniping, expanding payrolls and limited construction.

In Boston, the consolidation has not solved all the problems, according to Mr. Logue, but coupled with genuine human renewal program it has gone a long way to spurring the city's redevelopment.

As an example of the bureaucracy of New York's housing program and the almost insurmountable problems it creates he pointed to the massive urban-renewal area on Manhattan's West Side from 87th to 97th Streets between Amsterdam Avenue and Central Park West.

"Just look at everybody involved," he said. "You have the buildings department, you have the housing department, you have the real estate department, you have public works, you have the planning commission, the relocation people, the board of education people, the health people, and a half a dozen others."

"Each one has to agree and there is only one guy who can make them agree—and that's the mayor. If you were mayor of New Haven, you could get everybody to agree. When you're mayor of New York, it's not that easy."

What then should New York do?

According to Mr. Logue, the city should create a new authority—or give further powers to an existing one—under which one man would be able to handle all the planning, development, construction, and relocation for a single area—say the West Side. He would be responsible and make the decisions for all the departments and authorities that are now involved from deciding where a school or a hospital was needed to the relocation of the people—in the one designated area. Then, when the redevelopment was completed, the school would be turned over to the board of education for administering, the hospitals to the department of hospitals and the houses to the appropriate departments.

"It would be up to him to get things done," said Mr. Logue. "Responsibility is now so scattered that almost nothing gets done. Someone has to be given the authority to make decisions—and make them fast."

Asked if the mayor did not have the authority to make those decisions himself at present, Mr. Logue said, "The mayor has many other things to do. As it is, New York now has a 'pretty plans department' and a 'let's get something done department' and when they get together something sometimes gets done—maybe."

Asked if Milton Mollen, particularly in his new position as housing and development coordinator, did not fill the position of authority, Mr. Logue shook his head.

"New York doesn't need any more coordinators," he said. "It needs one central authority where decisions could be made. Mollen doesn't have that authority."

"I'm not saying this authority would work miracles immediately," he said. "I'm just saying something must be done. I'm not one who can sit back and think that a new broom will necessarily sweep clean. What can—and

must—be done is that the leaders must find a way of giving the city back to the people who live here.

#### COMMUNITY MENTAL HEALTH CENTERS ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1965

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. GRABOWSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRABOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Community Mental Health Centers Act of 1963 blazed the trail for effective modern care of the mentally ill. The centers, built by communities under the act, will provide the patient with the kind of care he needs whether it is intensive around-the-clock care or a matter of a few hours a day. This kind of care, tapered to the individual in his own community, has proved itself much more effective than the mass-produced impersonal care of large custodial institutions. Chances for recovery are demonstrably higher and the treatment time is almost always shorter for patients at community centers.

I do not think that any person familiar with the mental health field doubts the need for many, many more community mental health centers offering comprehensive care. The problem facing us today is how to get these centers started. Although such centers will provide better care at less cost in the long run, the initial expense of setting them up is high; higher than most communities can afford.

The Community Mental Health Centers Act of 1963 did half the job. H.R. 2985 will do the other half. Grants to cover construction costs are not enough. We must assist in the initial staffing costs too if we really want to help communities to develop mental health centers.

The 1963 act required each participating State to draw up comprehensive plans for mental health services. Twenty-six States have already reported to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare that their programs cannot be carried out or would be severely impeded unless some provision for initial staffing grants is made. H.R. 2985 responds to this need. It is carefully drawn up so as to enable States and communities to get a program going without allowing them to become dependent upon Federal funds for continuing operation. Staffing grants will be phased out over a 4-year period. For the first 15-month period up to 75 percent of allowable staffing costs could be covered by Federal grants. The next year the Federal share would be reduced to 60 percent, the year after that to 45 percent and in the final year the Federal share would be only 30 percent.

This legislation brings up the question of whether the States and communities will be in a better position to pay operational costs after a few years than they are at the outset. The answer is

“Yes.” It takes time to develop sources of funds but there is no question that the sources exist. The communities themselves will be able to provide much of the support through tax and voluntary funds. This has been the case in communities that already have mental health centers. Secondly, the States are taking an increasingly active role in assisting localities to provide community services. Twenty-four States have already established programs specifically designed for this purpose, including some matching grant programs for community outpatient, consultation, and rehabilitation services. The third source of funds will be from the patients themselves. There is a marked trend toward greater insurance coverage of the costs of mental illness. For example, mental illness insurance programs are beginning to be included by industry in wage agreements.

The amendments to the Community Mental Health Centers Act include an important provision that was not contained in the original staffing proposals 2 years ago. Under H.R. 2985, community mental health centers that are already in operation will be able to get staffing grants to assist them to add new services. In this way we shall avoid penalizing communities that have already set up their own centers.

There are two other provisions of the bill which I think it is also important to mention. First, the bill provides for a fair distribution of funds among the States by requiring the Secretary to take into account the relative needs of the States for community mental health center programs, their relative financial needs, and their populations. Second, the bill contains a “maintenance of effort” clause to prevent the States from simply substituting Federal funds for funds they are now putting into mental health.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2985 is a carefully drafted bill that will enable communities to fully meet their mental health needs. When this bill is passed we will be on the road to a new era in mental health care.

#### THE ARMENIAN TRAGEDY IN TURKEY IN 1915

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. GRABOWSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRABOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Armenian tragedy of 1915 was the saddest heritage of the First World War for the Armenian people. Even in their long and turbulent history, full of trials and tribulations and massacres, the tragedy of 1915 was quite unprecedented in its immensity and extent. It is difficult if not impossible to comprehend the nature of this tragedy, which, in less than 1 year, uprooted nearly all of the 2 million Armenians in Turkey. Some 1.5 million Armenians died while many hundreds of thousands were condemned to involun-

tary servitude in Turkish households and others sold to Arabs and Kurds as slaves. As if by some unaccountable stroke of fate, the Armenians in Turkey were singled out and carried off from an area three times the size of the New England States, with most of them doomed to certain death. The monstrous machinery which the rulers of Turkey had devised for bringing on this wholesale deportation and massacre worked so effectively and ceaselessly, that even before the end of that year they were congratulating themselves for ridding Turkey of its Armenian population.

There are so many causes for this tragedy, so many alleged and actual reasons for Turkish cruelty towards the Armenians that it is not easy even now to list and catalog them in full. While I will try to enumerate and elaborate on some of these causes, it would be well to begin with some background information on Armenia and the Armenian people.

Armenia is the name of the country in the high, mountainous plateau in the eastern and northeastern part of Asia Minor, with an area of about 100,000 square miles. This area has been the homeland of the Armenian people for at least 2,500 years, and perhaps for a much longer period. Today more than four-fifths of this area form part of Turkey. Only a small portion in the northeasternmost part, about 11,000 square miles, constitutes the Soviet Socialist Republic of Armenia—an integral part of the Soviet Union. The most characteristic feature of the land is its high elevation, most of it ranging well over 3,000 feet above sea level, and some reaching up to and above 6,000 feet. Armenia is a rugged and rough country, with a rather temperate climate, quite cold in winter and severely hot in dry summers. Only part of the country is productive agricultural land, but its fertile valleys and plains have produced abundant food under normal peaceful conditions for its hardy inhabitants. From most ancient days the country has been known as being rich in mineral and metallic natural resources, though to this day it has not been properly and adequately explored or surveyed.

The Armenian people have given their name to this land and have lived there. During the 9th–6th centuries before our era, part of the country was known by another name, Urartu. Centuries earlier the country was inhabited—in part, at least—by a people called Hurrians, who ruled over it during the 15th–13th centuries before our era. The coming of the Armenian people into the area and their origin is not quite clear. The generally accepted view has been that they came from Thrace sometime during the Greek migration to Asia Minor in the 11th century B.C., and then gradually moved to the Armenian tableland. More recently the prevalent view is that not all of the ancestors came from Thrace, but that many were of native stock, and the intermixture of these two groups gave rise to the Armenian people. Be that as it may, the Armenians lived in this land known by their name for more than 2,500 years,

until their almost total elimination from that part of Armenian territory which is part of today's Turkey.

The long and turbulent history of the Armenian people has been sad and tragic. Throughout their history the Armenians have enjoyed peace and tranquillity in their homeland for only brief periods. Their homeland has been the bridge as well as the battleground of invading and conquering hordes from the east. Because of their geographic location, the Armenians have suffered in the course of wars between Rome and Persia, between the Greeks and the Arabs, between the Greeks and the Turks, and finally between the Persians and the Turks. Innumerable times their homeland has been partitioned between Rome and Persia, and between the Turks and Persians.

From the 7th to the 10th century Armenia was under the suzerainty of the Arabs. But by the mid-11th century Seljuk Turks overran the country. For several centuries the Armenian people were subjected to the oppressive rule of these Seljuk overlords. When early in the 16th century nearly all Armenia was conquered by the Ottoman Turks, and from that time on, for four centuries, most of the Armenians lived under Ottoman sultans.

During their subjection to Ottoman Turks the Armenians struggled to maintain their national consciousness by keeping alive their national church and their language. Whenever they were oppressed by the Turks and whenever they felt the weight of the Ottoman yoke unbearable, they inevitably dreamed of the day when they could be free in their homeland, free from alien rulers. These aspirations were supported by their friends and sympathizers in the West. Late in the 19th century many Armenians felt that with the aid of European governments, they could obtain a measure of the autonomy to which they felt they were entitled. At the same time the Turkish Government, never admitting the validity of Armenian claims to equality and justice under the Turks, persecuted them for alleged conspiracy. Thus a very tense situation had developed by the turn of the century. The more the Armenian people pressed for some equality, the more the Turks resisted these Armenian claims. Numerous times the Turks resorted to mass murders and massacres, thereby hoping to discourage the Armenians from putting forth any claim for justice and equality. But such inhuman measures did not discourage the Armenians.

Massacres convinced the Armenian people that unless they could find a way of improving their unbearable lot, they were doomed to extinction as a distinct national community. And since they themselves could not bring about a change for the better, and since the Turkish Government was unwilling to do anything for them, they felt that the only way was to enlist the aid and assistance of European governments. As they made this move in desperation, they were overly optimistic. They felt that since these European governments had helped other Christian subjects of the Turks to attain autonomy and independ-

ence, these same governments would also aid them in their struggle. Of course, we know today that this was a grave miscalculation on their part. For a number of reasons, these governments, though sympathetic with the Armenian cause, could not and would not aid the Armenians. And during World War I, when none of them could come to their aid, they were at the mercy of angry Turks.

During the decades preceding that war, when Armenian leaders were quite active in enlisting European sympathy for their cause, the Turks became suspicious of these moves. They felt that if European governments became too involved in Armenian affairs, they would use that as an excuse to interfere in Turkey's internal affairs. And the more these European governments showed some concern over the lot of the Armenian people, the more suspicious became the Turks. It seems that then the Turkish Government had its own plan for getting rid of its Armenian population at the first opportune moment, when none of the European friends of the Armenian people could come to their aid.

The war of 1914-18 offered them the opportunity. At the time, Britain, France, and Russia were staunch supporters of the Armenian cause; but, as all these governments were involved in the war against the Turks, they could not restrain the Turks in their inhuman excesses. In less than a year these callous and clumsy, but shrewd and wily Turks, succeeded in carrying out their design of ridding Turkey of its Armenian population through deportation, massacres and slow death by famine and misery.

Today, 50 years after that tragic event, there are hardly any Armenians left in the historic Armenia that is part of the Turkish Republic, and only about 75,000 Armenians in certain Turkish cities remain of the once wealthy and prosperous Armenian community of about 2 million souls. Some fortunate ones who had survived this tragedy have since joined hands with their compatriots in the Russian-held portion of Armenia and have constituted their own Soviet Socialist Republic. On the 50th anniversary observance of this wanton genocide we do homage to the memory of its victims and wish peace and tranquillity to those living in a corner of their historic Armenia.

#### FARM PROGRAM

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, in the near future we will be discussing farm legislation, and in this regard I have just read a very interesting article by Lloyd Burlingham which I believe the House membership will be interested in.

It deals with the farm philosophy of that eminent agriculturalist, Dr. Gene Poirot, of Missouri. I have had the

pleasure of spending a little time with Dr. Poirot on his prairie farm and, frankly, I am much impressed by his reactionary approach to the chief problems of farm products and farm people.

At a later date I expect to have more to say on this significant article in the International Harvester farm magazine. For the present, I would like to submit it for the consideration of the other Members of the House.

#### A FARM PROGRAM THAT OBEYS NATURE'S LAW (By Lloyd Burlingham)

Gene Poirot farms in southwest Missouri, near Carthage. His university training is backed by many years of intimate association with research specialists in soils, crops, and livestock. On his own 800 acres he rebuilds wornout fields while running a successful farming operation, including a profitable cow herd. There are not too many such men. Gene Poirot may know more about American agriculture than any other man I have met.

Gene Poirot doesn't entirely agree with the present farm program. "National agriculture," he says, "is guided by leaders not wise enough to agree among themselves; by politicians whose success is measured in number of votes, and by economists who have never been hungry. It should be guided by scientists and mathematicians of the caliber of those directing space capsules to Venus and the Moon; interesting activities, but less important than protecting our food-producing capacities for coming generations."

The Missourian charges that we have more seriously abused the rules of Mother Nature than any other people in all history. And, man, he charges, is the only living creature taking certain vital qualities from the soil and failing to return them to the earth at death.

Keep in place: Poirot calls this Mother Nature's basic law: "Keep the soil in place and return that which has been taken." He warns that, unless we begin obeying this law or find an acceptable means by which to hold down the earth's population, that there just will not be enough food to go around. Other thoughtful men share this opinion.

So far, Poirot observes, no national policy has meted out penalties for soil robbing, nor have rewards been set up for obeying the law of Nature, requiring putting back in the soil the equivalent of what is taken away.

Poirot believes rebuilding fertility is possible only when farmers undertake the task. They can do the job only when they are paid for putting in the soil a new backlog of food nutrients. Many do not have the capital which must be expended in soil restoration. It is Poirot's thesis that, since the general public has benefited from low food prices over the years, the public should now be called on to pay at least part of the cost of rebuilding our soils.

Restore soil: The Missouri conservationist suggests that the farmer plant as he pleases, so long as he is given an alternative option to make an equal or, possibly, greater profit by restoring his soil—and being paid for demonstrated success.

Says Poirot, "Provide a market to which a farmer can turn when other prices are too low for him, one which will buy, at a predetermined price, tons per acre of a suitable crop for soil restoration. Support this market at a fair price per ton for a suitable crop."

For example, in an area where sweet clover is a suitable crop for soil building, suppose a dry-weight ton is determined to be worth \$25 as a restorer when plowed under. The land would be improved, the farmer would make a profit.

The price at which soil restoration is bought becomes the farmer's minimum wage. Balance this cost against the present expense of surplus control and storage, and Poirot's soil improvement proposal looks like a good buy.

Gene Poirot, Missouri conservationist, believes a national farm policy should be based on Nature's law.

#### YOUTH OPPORTUNITIES ACT

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, we will soon be called upon to make a decision on the Youth Opportunities Act and to what extent the Congress will enlarge the scope of its activities and the amount of funds to be made available for the administration of the act.

Any new endeavor in any field of Government activities is bound to earn its share of criticism. The antipoverty program is no exception.

While constructive criticism is helpful to Congress as well as to the administration, the false and destructive type of criticism can endanger the whole program.

One of the most dangerous rumors spread against the poverty program is the charge of exorbitance and extravagance in the handling of the salary schedules paid to employees of the Office of Youth Opportunity. While there may be isolated cases of questionable salary arrangements in a given area I do believe the record ought to be made on the overall picture.

With this in mind, I submit a letter from Director Shriver to the Honorable ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, chairman of the Education and Labor Committee. The statement follows:

HON. ADAM CLAYTON POWELL,  
Chairman, Ad Hoc Subcommittee on Poverty,  
Committee on Education and Labor,  
House of Representatives, Washington,  
D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: During my appearance on April 12 before the ad hoc Subcommittee on Poverty a number of questions were raised concerning salary levels for local community action officials, single purpose community action grants, and the representation or involvement of the poor in the planning, conduct, and administration of community action programs. In view of the importance of these questions, and the amount of attention they have received in the course of the hearings, I believe that it may be helpful for the Subcommittee to have some additional information on each of these points.

I am also taking the liberty of enclosing a justification of the amendments to the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 which we are proposing (as contained in H.R. 7048), and a summary statement in support of our authorization request. These are taken from or based upon the written presentation which I furnished at the time of my appearance. I believe it might be of some help to the Subcommittee in its deliberation if both of these items were separately available, and I am requesting accordingly that they be inserted in this manner in the RECORD.

The enclosed statements on salaries, single purpose community action grants, and involvement of the poor show what we have done and why. They demonstrate, in my view, that we have succeeded in establishing local salary levels that are fair, appropriate, and comparable with salaries already established for those holding other responsible positions in communities where our programs have been undertaken. They demonstrate that we have succeeded in giving effect to the basic purpose of the provision for broadly based community action programs while retaining and exercising the kind of flexibility for funding single-purpose programs which, we believe, the Congress intended. They demonstrate that we have succeeded in community after community, and typically without fanfare or strife, in the historically revolutionary step of securing participation by the poor themselves in program roles that will enable them to play an active, affirmative, creative and expanding part in the formulation, continuing development and implementation of those programs.

I do not suggest that initial success in dealing with either these problems or the many others which necessarily confront us in prosecuting the war on poverty provides any excuse for the slightest relaxation on our efforts. We have nevertheless begun, and we believe that our beginning, fairly evaluated, is a good one.

We do not propose, however, to accept as a program what is only the beginning of a program. A program implies a goal and requires progress—progress measured not in terms of money expended or isolated accomplishments but results achieved—week by week, month by month, and year by year—in every significant particular that contributes to attainment of the goal at the earliest possible time. We expect to evaluate local programs on this overall basis. We would hope that our own efforts would be judged, and judged critically, in a similar fashion. We have sought, and will continue, to cooperate with the Congress in every possible way to facilitate its exercise of this judgment. We are confident that it will be exercised fairly in light of the size of the job, its difficulty, and our sincerity of purpose.

Sincerely,

SARGENT SHRIVER,  
Director.

#### DEDICATION OF VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION HOSPITAL, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. TEAGUE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the remarks of the distinguished Vice President of the United States, the Honorable HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, on the occasion of the dedication of the new Veterans' Administration hospital for Washington, D.C.

This splendid new structure, so beautifully equipped, is a project which many of us have worked on for years, and which it is a distinct pleasure to now see brought to completion and full operation. It was a pleasure to be present at the formal dedication of this institution for the care of our sick and disabled vet-

erans, and I am glad that it was possible for the Vice President of the United States to formally dedicate this, the newest of the Veterans' Administration hospitals, the only one located in the Nation's Capital.

His remarks follow:

TEXT OF REMARKS BY THE HONORABLE HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES, ON THE OCCASION OF THE WASHINGTON, D.C., VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION HOSPITAL DEDICATION

Thank you very much, Mr. Driver, the distinguished and able Administrator of this great program relating to our veterans; and the reverend clergy; my colleagues in Congress, and I surely want to pay particular tribute to a gentleman whose nickname I think describes the character of the man when he's on your side, or if he isn't, TIGER TEAGUE, as we call him, the chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, and JOE EVINS, of Independent Offices Appropriations Committee, other Members of Congress; and to all of the gallant and faithful servants, public servants, of the Veterans' Administration, my special greeting to you, and may I take a moment to say a special thanks to you—all too often we indulge ourselves in the criticism of our civil servants and all too seldom in a word of commendation and praise, which is richly deserved by the thousands and thousands of people that faithfully serve the Government of the United States and the people of this great Republic, day in and day out.

I want to commend the medical administration of our Veterans' Administration. I regret, of course, that the Director, Dr. McNinch, isn't with us today, but his assistant, his aid, is here, Dr. Musser, and Dr. Ready, and Dr. Robinson—these men we honor for their work beyond the call of duty. How fortunate it is that we have had such distinguished medical men, administrators in charge of this program.

It is my distinct honor and a very high privilege to share in this dedication of this new hospital with you.

This is the newest and the most modern of our VA hospitals; and I venture to say to the hospital director, Dr. Ready, and to the area medical director, Dr. Robinson, that this hospital is one of the newest and most modern hospital facilities of its kind anywhere, whether it's in veterans medicine or any other kind of medicine or hospital care. More than 8,000 of our veterans will come here each year to receive the care this hospital will so well provide, and they will receive good care because the fact is that medical and hospital care in our veterans hospitals today is the best that this country or that the medical arts and the healing arts can provide; and, as we are here today to dedicate this hospital, might I also add as has been indicated in our prayer that we dedicate ourselves to the continuance of these high standards of service and of care and of medicine which this structure that we see here today epitomizes.

What will it take to maintain these standards, high standards? Well, first, it has been agreed that it will take modern and functional efficiency—and may I digress to say that your Government wants to make sure that our hospitals are modern. You don't help anybody maintaining and sustaining an institution or a facility that is obsolete, and we want to make sure that they're efficient.

Today, the VA is engaged in the largest hospital building program in history. Of course, we hear about a few facilities that may be closed up, but I might add that we're engaged in an expansion program, not a retracting program. At this moment, at some stage in the construction pipeline, there are 355 VA projects underway; and these projects are not undertaken just for

their own sake. They are designed for one purpose; to provide the best care possible to those who so richly and justly deserve it.

Now, second, if we are going to maintain the high standards that we want, it will take effectiveness of administration and of operation. This means locating VA hospitals and hospital beds where they can treat the greatest number of veterans. The VA system has each year increased the number of veterans treated. This year, for example, I've been informed that the Veterans' Administration hospitals will treat 100,000 more veterans than they did in 1960. Efficient placement of facilities makes this possible and, indeed, efficient placement of facilities makes it mandatory if we are going to treat that number, that increased number of patients.

Third, it will take comprehensiveness of care to maintain high standards. A veteran who enters the doors of this hospital will benefit from the availability of a full spectrum of modern medical techniques, ranging from open-heart surgery and radioactive cobalt therapy to a special kidney treatment unit which will literally save dozens of lives each year. I think it can be said that whatever modern medicine can provide will be available in this hospital.

The President's budget request for fiscal year 1966—I address myself now to our beloved friends in Congress who, by the way, are mighty generous and considerate in these matters—and they are. This budget request for 1966 includes, as these men well know, more funds for medical care than at any time in VA history. It clearly reflects this administration's response to the need for continued high standards of VA medicine. I am happy to say that I had an opportunity to review that budget and feel that it is, without a doubt, the best budget in terms of medical and hospital care that we will be privileged to have, and I know that it will receive the most generous and favorable assistance of the Congress of the United States—TRICE, I want you to clap here on this. Well, we have no problem here, I'll tell you.

Now, let me just cite for you what we think these funds requested will do.

They'll support activation of three new hospitals, including this one, modern hospitals that every American can be proud of. You'll just be proud to point to them and say, this is what the people of America think of their veterans.

These funds will support the new nursing care program in VA operated facilities with an estimated average of 1,500 patients daily—expanded nursing care.

These funds will support establishment of 13 special centers for heart surgery, of 26 emphysema treatment units, of 2-day treatment centers, and of two mental hygiene clinics, and a new blind rehabilitation center. Now, these are all specialties—this is over and beyond what we ordinarily have in a hospital unit, and these funds are in the new budget and are directed toward the expansion of these specialized facilities. We now know how to treat many of these serious illnesses and abnormalities and, if we know how to do it, it's the determination of your Government to see that it's done for the people that need it.

These funds will support expansion of medical and surgical bed sections in the neuropsychiatric hospitals, and they will support the expansion of capability of the 11 centers for treatment of chronic kidney disease.

The budget of this year will support an increase in staff to provide corrective treatment for speech problems at 20 or more hospitals, rehabilitation which we have found it is not only possible but profitable making people once again whole so that they can be self-sustaining and be happy people.

The funds will support strengthening of VA's clinical laboratory services, and will

support the expansion of the veterans' medical and hospital research program. You see, we view the VA hospital system, not as a burden, not as a charge on the public, but as a national resource. Veterans medicine is today an essential part, a very significant part of the national health program, and we are determined to bring the benefits and the miracles of modern medicine, as we know it, to be within the reach of every section of America and all the people of America, veteran or nonveteran; but, surely, the first claim to that medical care is upon those who have been willing to give all that they had for their country, and that's why veterans medicine must be the best.

Now, the VA hospital program has been shaped so that it may render to veterans the best care in the power of modern science and in doing so, help all Americans through medical research, and then help all Americans through the training of much-needed doctors and other professional people in the healing arts.

A word about research, because in research the VA has one of the finest medical and clinical research programs in the world, and on this platform today are men that made this possible. I know they have been mentioned before, but in the 16 years that I served in the Congress of the United States, I had the privilege of working with these men, and I want to pay much overdue credit and thanks to them—when we think of those postwar years, and when we think of how the veterans medicine has improved and how it has surged forward to be recognized for its high standards, we can't help but remember, as was indicated here, General Hawley, Dr. Paul Magnuson, Dr. or Adm., Joel Boone, and Dr. Middleton and now, of course, Dr. McNinch. I have had the privilege of working with these men and I know the hard work that went into their program efforts, and I know of the sacrifice that they made, and if there are any heroes for the sick, if there are any heroes for the Veterans' Administration, they're right there on this platform today and should so be recognized by the American people.

Now, let me just cite that in the last 10 years—well, I should say really in the last about 20 years, our research program has grown from almost nothing to where it stands today. In the last 10 years it has increased by some 700 percent. Some of the finest medical research in the world is carried on right now in the veterans hospitals without any sacrifice of care, might I add, in fact, with benefit to care; and this hospital right here will play a major role in that research record.

But the contribution being made by the Veterans' Administration to the health of the entire Nation is not confined to the products of its laboratories. For the VA, through its program of affiliation, is now involved in a creative, mutually beneficial partnership, which Mr. Driver has mentioned, with the Nation's leading medical schools.

American medicine is better because of this program, and these hospitals are better because of our great universities and teaching schools, and our great medical schools. The medical profession and the Veterans' Administration have worked as partners, and the universities and the Veterans' Administration medical division have worked as partners. The whole world is the better, and through this partnership with the medical schools—right here for many years, Georgetown University, Howard University, and George Washington University have a partnership arrangement for the training of resident doctors with this hospital.

Through this partnership with medical schools, approximately one-half of the junior medical students in the United States will receive part of their clinical experience in veterans hospitals. A total of 3,200 out of 7,400 registered senior medical students

have a part of their fourth-year clinical training in VA hospitals.

Approximately 10 percent of all the medical residencies in America are in VA hospitals. Many of America's best specialty training programs have developed through combined university and affiliated VA hospital programs. Thousands of lives are saved every year because of this partnership. It is estimated that 15 percent of all certified physicians today have received part or all of their specialty training in Veterans' Administration hospitals. So, when somebody tells you about the cost of this medical program, and I've heard about it when I was in Congress, you just remind them and say, you're alive today because of it, and I don't think that's a cost.

Now it's my—I just choked on that last one—I may need a little of that speech therapy they're going to give here—it's my pleasant duty to join with the Administrator of Veterans Affairs, Mr. William J. Driver, in presenting this official dedication certificate to the Director of this hospital, Dr. Thomas J. Ready, and to repose in him the heavy responsibility for carrying forward the work that he loves so much and the work that he will do so well, the work of healing the sick and the distressed who enter these doors over which he will have administrative direction, and, Dr. Ready, I surely want to wish you the very, very best, Doctor.

#### CITIZENS' COMMITTEE TO FIGHT REPEAL OF SECTION 14(b) OF TAFT-HARTLEY ACT

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, in my newsletter of April 29 I called attention to formation of a 35-member citizens' committee to fight repeal of section 14b of the Taft-Hartley Act, and the fact that it had selected as its honorary chairman the coauthor of that act. We now have before us the first fruits of that association in the form of full-page advertisements which appeared in the May 3 Washington Evening Star and the May 4 Washington Post. In these advertisements, the citizens' committee expressed concern for the fundamental American rights of employees. There are two aspects of this expression which should be noted.

First, one fundamental American right that was not mentioned was the right of employees to determine by majority vote their legitimate goals as to wages and working conditions. This committee evidently does not believe that the American worker is capable or entitled to determine whether or not he wants the protection of a union security clause in the contract under which he works. In the 31 States which do not restrict the employee's right to vote on contract terms, the worker is free to negotiate for a union shop and thus obtain the protection afforded by requiring all employees in his bargaining unit to contribute equally toward the cost of the services rendered by his union. In a State that restricts this right to vote, the worker cannot have the protection of a



union security agreement if he wants it. In which States does the worker have the greater freedom?

Second, this committee which is concerned with the right of an employee not to join a union is composed of 17 company presidents, 6 board chairmen, 3 professors, 2 pastors, 3 politicians, 2 presidents of farm bureaus—agricultural employees are not covered by the act—1 farmer, and 1 author. Among these guarantors of employee rights there is not one representative of a workingman's organization affected by the Taft-Hartley Act.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the working men and women of America are better able to decide for themselves their best interests than are the groups represented in this committee. The repeal of section 14b will enable them to decide by insuring their fundamental American right to vote in the plants where they work.

#### OCEANOGRAPHY

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. HUOT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUOT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my thoughts on what is the last area of unexplored territory on the face of the earth. I refer to the vast unknown areas that lie beneath the surface of our oceans. Webster defines oceanography as "a science dealing with the ocean and its phenomena." For many years, man has used the oceans of earth for traveling and as a source for food. We, in 1965, still know very little about the vast area deep below the ocean surface.

I submitted a bill yesterday which, if passed, would establish a National Oceanographic Council for the purpose of setting up a program of research, exploration, and factfinding of the oceans and the lands beneath them.

If we could project our sights into the future, this particular bill could very well be one of the most important pieces of legislation to come before the Congress in its history. We are well aware of the food shortage problem in the world. We are also aware of the population explosion that threatens the very existence of mankind. We have, and rightfully so, centered our energies in recent years to the exploration of the universe. The United States has made tremendous gains in the race for space. But we must not be singular in our purpose and now must lay the groundwork for other avenues and the only unexplored avenue which has been literally ignored since the beginning of time is located here on earth and encompasses nearly two-thirds of the earth's surface.

The United States has a great potential in this field. As the years go by, this may be a costly venture, but I can think of no one project which may prove to be more useful in the future.

Presently, the Navy Department has taken the initiative in elevating the science of oceanography to a level commensurate with its long range of importance in this country. I believe a larger and more specified department is necessary to coordinate and fund the necessary operations for further research.

The National Oceanographic Council would also be responsible for the construction and maintaining of deep submergence vehicles and the developing of materials needed for this construction, and it would center the leadership in this field which presently is in the hands of 22 Federal agencies.

The Navy cannot continue to do the job alone. The problems of oceanographic exploration are mounting and requires a massive effort from one direction. I believe the establishment of a National Oceanographic Council is the answer.

More will be said about the proposed legislation at a later date. It is my hope, because of the importance of this bill, that every Member will take it upon himself to read and study this bill and possibly make recommendations to further the cause of oceanography.

#### JOINT RESOLUTION TO SET UP A DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CRIME INVESTIGATION

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join the able senior Senator from Oregon, Senator MORSE, in advocating a thorough study of crime in the District of Columbia. My resolution, which I am introducing today, is a House joint resolution proposing that the investigation of crime in the District should be made jointly by the District Committees of the Senate and the House in the same way that Senator MORSE proposes in his Senate resolution.

While I think it is not fair to say that crime in the District of Columbia is worse than in cities of comparable population in other parts of the country, nevertheless when women are afraid to walk on many of the streets of the city at night, including the Capitol Grounds, when repeated instances of attacks occur, and when the police feel it is necessary to police the Capitol Grounds and many of the best areas of the city with police dogs, we all agree that the situation is intolerable.

If the District of Columbia, with all the wealth and power of the United States behind it, cannot reduce to a tolerable minimum crime, what other city can hope to do so in our country. With the resources of the Government of the United States available, I feel that a thorough study can reveal what needs to be done to reduce crime to a tolerable minimum. If it is lack of education, the Government of the United States can

provide the educational opportunity. If the cause is slums, the United States of America can surely remove the slums in its Capital City. If it is a lack of playgrounds and adequate recreation, the U.S. Government surely can provide whatever is needed. If the present situation is due to lack of sufficient number of police personnel in the Capital of our country, that personnel can be provided. If an entirely new or, at least, more efficient approach to the problem of juvenile delinquency is needed, the Government of the United States can do that. As President Johnson indicated a bit ago, the Capital of our country should be a model for procedures to prevent and to arrest crime for the other cities of the country.

I believe Senator MORSE is right therefore and that a thorough, adequately financed study should be made in which the best minds of the country are brought to bear upon the problem so that a program may be devised which would show the country and the world that crime can be reduced to a tolerable minimum in the cities of America.

#### LOSS OF FISH RESOURCES IN HUDSON RIVER

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BINGHAM] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, yesterday my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. OTTINGER], brought to the attention of this House and the American people one of the serious problems of the Hudson River, the loss of its valuable anadromous fish resources.

This sad story has been repeated time and time again. The salmon no longer run where the Grand Coulee Dam has been built, the fish of the Mississippi are decimated by industrial wastes. The once-rich resources of our rivers and streams have been wasted recklessly.

This is a tragedy all the more remarkable in that it has no villains. The resources of rivers are being destroyed as a result of ignorance and indifference, not deliberate plunder.

Mr. Speaker, the people of the Hudson River and, in fact, concerned citizens all over the United States are aroused. They will no longer tolerate this apathy and the great loss that results from it. It behooves the officials responsible for natural resources to listen to this rising protest and to act.

The destruction of the anadromous fish of the Hudson is just one of the many problems that challenge the growth and development of this great American river. We are faced here with a problem which is of grave concern to the residents along the river's banks. But in a larger sense, the Hudson is a national problem because it typifies the challenges that must be met by other great American rivers which, like the

Hudson, run through settled areas and support industry and commerce. This is the challenge of the new conservation: to find a formula which will allow these rivers to continue to play their vital, growing role in the economic lives of the residents along their shores and yet preserve the unique scenic, recreation, and conservation values that can never be replaced once they are lost.

Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to join Mr. OTTINGER in introducing a bill to establish a Hudson national scenic riverway. This measure will provide the formula and start the long and difficult process of rehabilitation and restoration for the Hudson.

Now, it may be that there are interests that would attempt to turn this into a political issue. I would warn them against such folly. A total of nine other Congressmen from both parties have introduced legislation similar to the measure that Mr. OTTINGER and I introduced. The two distinguished Senators from New York have cosponsored a similar bill before the other body. All are dedicated to keeping the important issue of conservation above politics. Even more, I would warn that the people will not tolerate anything but bipartisan cooperation and a spirit of high and common purpose.

In this regard, I think the following letter by a distinguished conservationist of the Hudson River replying to an editorial in the Tarrytown News is worthy of wide attention. In this letter, which appeared in the Tarrytown News on April 22, 1965, Mr. Dominick J. Pirone, a biologist and a consultant for the League of Saltwater Sportsmen, makes what I believe are valid points about the mistakes of the past. But more important, he typifies the thrust of the future—a broad public call for action.

APRIL 16, 1965.

The DAILY NEWS:

Your editorial of March 17 concerning the Ottinger scenic riverway bill recently came to my attention.

New York State is not delegating any authority that it currently makes use of to Washington. The reason that the whole question has reached the Federal level is that New York State officialdom has either remained inactive in this affair or stood by lethargically or even lent support to factions invading the public domain for private profit.

Just who has what jurisdiction over the Hudson and its wildlife? I have been trying to get a straight answer on this question for many months; the only replies forthcoming were buckpassing and "I don't really know." The said part is, those in State government, one would assume, would be vitally concerned.

With no recourse in this State, to whom were the sportsmen, conservationists, and those dedicated citizens interested in the scenic, cultural, and historical values of the Hudson to turn?

Luckily for Americans, present and future Representative OTTINGER was immediately responsive to an emergency situation. He, and only he, had the courage and foresight to take action at once.

His bill, and all others on any issue whatsoever, do, I trust, receive careful and appropriate consideration before being passed by the Congress.

That Con Edison will "add to the beauties surrounding Storm King" is an unfounded

supposition opposed by all factual considerations. You seem to have read one of their advertisements. How many of the hundreds of opposing articles are you ignoring?

What will this plant, handling 12 billion gallons of water a day do to the ecology of the river? Will we have a repeat of the disastrous 1963 fish kills at Indian Point, perhaps in a less obvious form? These are the questions that should be fully answered before a spadeful of earth is turned by imported labor, or an out-of-State engineer is allowed to create a Niagara-on-the-Hudson by pushing a button in Manhattan.

If tax assets in terms of human construction are to be the only factors motivating planning for the future of the river, why not poison it outright to let future generations know that we were not sluggards in our destruction of their natural heritage?

Do you truly deny the right of thousands of citizens to protest when "investments" by private individuals or corporations threaten what is theirs and their children's to enjoy?

Representative OTTINGER, in presenting his riverway bill, cannot logically be accused of making political hay. He faced up to an issue laid before him by average honest concerned citizens, knowing that giant legal staffs and corporate business minds, which seem to be motivated only by monetary gains, would try their unremitting best to whip him into the ground by any and all means available to them.

How can you conclude that the Storm King issue has turned out to be a dud is beyond comprehension. The basic issues are as alive today as ever, and Representative OTTINGER has the fullest respect and most grateful thanks of his constituents for all that he has done and will do to see that the interests of the citizenry are protected.

State officials at all levels have abandoned the sportsmen and conservationists on this vital question. Investigation by responsible parties outside of our ineffective State bureaucracies is clearly called for and is coming.

We are not asking for Washington to become master in New York State, and certainly we are not begging financial aid. We are stating that what is good for one company is not necessarily good for the people of this State just because that company and those individuals being remunerated tell us that theirs is the great good. We are asking for somebody to do something to save all of the irreplaceable wildlife and other values now slipping from our grasp. For a goodly period of time, Representative OTTINGER was the sole official listener, and you condemn him. I believe that a retraction is due him.

Our Founding Fathers certainly would have abhorred what Washington and informed citizenry see as the "rape of the Hudson." The possibilities of damaging the major spawning grounds of this State's striped bass, the stringing of ugly powerlines to mar forever inspiring natural vistas, and many other possible destructive consequences of present and forthcoming projects on the Hudson, indicate to me that you should reexamine these issues that concern us all.

DOMINICK J. PIRONE,

Consulting Biologist to the Long Island League of Saltwater Sportsmen.

#### DEDICATION OF RESEARCH VESSEL "EASTWARD"

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HENDERSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, May 1, I attended the dedication ceremonies of the research vessel *Eastward* at Beaufort, N.C. This vessel has been provided by the National Science Foundation to Duke University and will be operated from the university's Marine Biological Laboratory located on Pivers Island in the Beaufort-Morehead City Harbor.

As a part of the dedication ceremonies, John M. Drewry, chief counsel of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, spoke briefly but most informatively and under unanimous consent I include his remarks in today's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

REMARKS OF JOHN M. DREWRY, CHIEF COUNSEL, HOUSE COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES, DEDICATION CEREMONIES, RESEARCH VESSEL "EASTWARD," BEAUFORT, N.C., MAY 1, 1965

Dr. Cole, Dr. Knight, Dr. Menzies, Congressman HENDERSON, Congressman KORNEGAY, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, instead of hearing me today, you were scheduled to hear the chairman of our full Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, Congressman HERBERT C. BONNER of Washington, N.C. Congressman ALTON LENNON, of Wilmington, chairman of our Subcommittee on Oceanography also had hoped to be here. Both—with extreme regret—have had to decline because of other pressing commitments in Washington. Both have asked me to tell you how sorry they are that they cannot be here on this very significant occasion. Both of them are deeply interested in development and progress of our oceanographic program.

It is a pleasure and a great privilege for me to be here to represent our committee and to join with all of you in the dedication of the new biological research vessel, *Eastward*. She is fully modern, specially designed and equipped, and an invaluable adjunct to the Marine Laboratory of Duke University and its comprehensive program in the marine sciences.

It is most appropriate that this ceremony should serve to bring together leaders of science, education, and government. Each group here represented is looking toward this ship and what she symbolizes for the strengthening of our national posture in its economic, scientific, and military aspects. The Congress is a vitally concerned participant in this program.

Truly the dedication of the *Eastward* represents arrival at a significant stage in our national oceanographic program—at a broad understanding of the vital need to learn and use all we can of the 75 percent of the earth's surface that is covered by the world oceans.

There have been, of course, men of imagination and vision who, during the course of our history, have seen the need to probe the secrets of the seas. Benjamin Franklin did pioneer work on the Gulf Stream. Matthew Fontaine Maury, our first real oceanographer, well over 100 years ago, established a ship of opportunity program under which merchant ships reported oceanic phenomena from all over the world to the Navy Hydrographic Office which he created. Information such as data on winds and currents and the sighting of whales and other cetaceans were charted for the benefit of seafarers. With this knowledge, our clipper ships were able to take advantage of the hitherto unpredictable sea and to pile up speed and safety records which were the envy and awe of other maritime nations.

But, for the most part, until very recently, man's awareness of the seas around him has varied from disdain to superstition. His use of them has been clumsy and superficial. The turn of this decade brought a drastic change to our view of the seas.

As the mineral resources of the lands began to become depleted—as population has grown at unprecedented rates—as potential enemies of great strength have threatened to bury us on and under the sea—we have realized we can no longer be complacent about the vast, untapped resources of the oceans. No longer can we be shy about moving forcefully and urgently into what President Melville Grosvenor of the National Geographic Society has so aptly called—"a realm where man is still an intruder."

The call for action and the magnitude of the challenge came with a report of the National Academy of Sciences in early 1959. That report turned a glaring light on a problem of national survival. As a member of the Academy committee put it, "we know less about the bottom of the ocean than we do about the backside of the moon."

We were not only deficient in knowledge, but in the manpower and facilities—the ships and the laboratories and the instruments—to increase our knowledge.

When the report of the Academy was brought to the attention of Congressman BONNER, he immediately appointed a Subcommittee on Oceanography to study the problem and recommend legislative action. Implementation of the Academy report was impossible without congressional support.

Though the temptation is strong (because our committee has been so deeply involved in it for the past 6 years), I will refrain from recounting the exciting developments that have brought us to where we are today.

We have only begun—but it is a good beginning.

Suffice it to say that the Congress, the executive branch of the Federal Government, the States, educational institutions, and industry have moved forward in concert toward a common goal. Government action has added to our fleet over 40 new oceanographic vessels, including the *Eastward*. Industry has added still more as it participates in Government programs or moves forward with plans to exploit the ocean resources. Maury's ship of opportunity concept is being revived as the wide-ranging ships of our merchant marine, coupled with new high-speed instrumentation, show the way to a real breakthrough in the Herculean task of acquiring systematic and synoptic survey data covering vast areas of the oceans.

The manpower gap is being closed as great educational institutions such as Duke University establish new courses in the marine sciences, build laboratories and acquire new vessels—the essential tools for the study of the oceans. Duke's cooperative research and training program in biological oceanography is one of the most impressive developments of recent years. Illustrative of the fact that, though we are only now formally dedicating *Eastward*, she has dedicated herself to full employment ever since her delivery last year. Her time has been used for research and training by scientists and students from several other institutions. Dr. Knight told me some time ago that she was committed for 2 years ahead for use by scientists and institutions throughout the East—the South—and as far west as Kansas. I might note, too, that Beaufort is a happy choice for her home port and the location of the Duke Laboratory, for here we have a complex of State and Federal laboratories situated at a most vital spot on the seacoast where the north and south Atlantic waters mix to form a rich marine environment for study and exploitation.

Let me close by telling you on behalf of Congressman BONNER, Congressman LENNON,

and, indeed, our whole committee, that we are pleased and proud to have been able to participate in the oceanographic program of which Duke University and the *Eastward* are such important parts. Our enthusiastic interest will continue.

#### SIX-MONTH REPORT OF MANPOWER SUBCOMMITTEE

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HENDERSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, the Manpower Subcommittee of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service is today releasing its regular 6-month report on improved manpower management in the Federal Government.

The report covers examples of management achievements in the departments and agencies for the period July through December 1964. It shows that in December 1964, employment was 7,400 below December a year ago. In addition, the subcommittee report contains examples of improved management showing savings in excess of \$25 million and for the quarter ending December 1964, the abolishment of 3,613 positions under the provisions of section 125 (b) of the Government Employees Salary Reform Act of 1964.

We wish to congratulate the executive branch on these accomplishments. This indeed is evidence of progress toward a more efficient and economic form of Government.

Copies of this report are available for each Member and we will be happy to see that each of you receives a copy.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. RESNICK (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for an indefinite period, on account of illness.

Mr. STEPHENS (at the request of Mr. DAVIS of Georgia), for May 4, 1965, on account of official business.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. SAYLOR, for 60 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CONTE (at the request of Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota), for 60 minutes, on May 6.

To the following Members (at the request of Mr. SCHEUER) to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous matter:

Mr. COOLEY, for 60 minutes, on May 5.

Mr. KASTENMEIER, for 30 minutes, on May 5.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. WOLFF and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DANIELS and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ZABLOCKI and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. LAIRD during general debate on H.R. 7765 and to include tables and charts and other extraneous matter.

Mr. HARRIS to revise and extend his remarks made in Committee of the Whole and include a table.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. SPRINGER.

Mrs. BOLTON.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SCHEUER) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. MINISH.

Mr. ALBERT.

Mr. CALLAN.

Mr. PUCINSKI.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee.

#### ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 5702. An act to extend for 1 year the date on which the National Commission on Food Marketing shall make a final report to the President and to the Congress and to provide necessary authorization of appropriations for such Commission.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 5, 1965, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1048. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting copies of reports of every institution, organization, corporation, or association other than U.S. Government, government of the District of Columbia, and foreign governments, owning property exempt from taxation, and the use thereof, during calendar year 1964, pursuant to section 3 of Public Law 77-846; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1049. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a list of properties specifically exempted from taxation, and their use, during calendar year 1964, pursuant to subsection E of section 1 of Public Law 77-846; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1050. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of overstatement of job opportunities estimated to be created in economically depressed areas, Area Redevelopment Administration, Department of Commerce; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1051. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States transmitting a report of possible need for clarification of statutory provision limiting the amount of Federal financial assistance to industrial or commercial projects, Area Redevelopment Administration, Department of Commerce; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1052. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation of certain aliens, pursuant to Public Law 87-885; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1053. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting a copy of the order suspending deportation on the case of Leon Morris Estes, A-4 419 302, pursuant to Public Law 87-885; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3997. A bill to amend section 753(b) of title 28, United States Code, to provide for the recording of proceedings in the U.S. district courts by means of electronic sound recording as well as by shorthand or mechanical means; with amendments (Rept. No. 281). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 237. A bill to make certain provisions in connection with the construction of the Garrison diversion unit, Missouri River Basin project, by the Secretary of the Interior; with amendments (Rept. No. 282). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 364. Resolution providing for the consideration of S. 701, an act to carry out the obligations of the United States under the International Coffee Agreement, 1962, signed at New York on September 28, 1962, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 283). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COLMER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 365. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 7657, a bill to authorize appropriations during fiscal year 1966 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels, and research, development, test, and evaluation, for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 284). Referred to the House Calendar.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAIR:

H.R. 7835. A bill to free farmers from Government control; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BATTIN:

H.R. 7836. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to abolish the renewal requirement for licenses in the safety and special radio services, and for other purposes; to

the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CLEVELAND:

H.R. 7837. A bill to encourage physicians and dentists who have received student loans under programs established pursuant to title VII of the Public Health Service Act to practice their professions in areas having a shortage of physicians or dentists; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.R. 7838. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide that certain coprecipitates of major milk proteins shall be admitted free of duty; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. DWYER:

H.R. 7839. A bill to amend section 2 of the Export Control Act of 1949; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FALLON:

H.R. 7840. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to conduct a complete investigation and study of water utilization and control of the Chesapeake Bay Basin; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GILLIGAN:

H.R. 7841. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act, to promote quality and price stabilization, to define and restrain certain unfair methods of distribution and to confirm, define, and equalize the rights of producers and resellers in the distribution of goods identified by distinguishing brands, names, or trademarks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GRIDER:

H.R. 7842. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide a new system of overtime compensation for postal field service employees, to eliminate compensatory time in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H.R. 7843. A bill to amend titles 10 and 37, United States Code, to authorize the survivors of a member of the Armed Forces who dies while on active duty to be paid for his unused accrued leave; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HALL:

H.R. 7844. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to prohibit opening of mail by the Internal Revenue Service; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MINISH:

H.R. 7845. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to repeal the excise tax on communications; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OTTINGER:

H.R. 7846. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to permit the Surgeon General to treat persons for addiction to barbiturates, amphetamines, and other habit-forming drugs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.R. 7847. A bill to amend the Small Business Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. STANTON:

H.R. 7848. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Army to establish a national cemetery in Ohio; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 7849. A bill to provide for the development of ocean resources, to provide for economic development of the Continental Shelf, to provide for expanded research in the oceans and the Great Lakes, to establish a National Oceanographic Council, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (by request):

H.R. 7850. A bill to amend section 1822(a) of title 38, United States Code, to extend the provisions for treble-damage actions to

direct loan and insured loan cases; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 7851. A bill to equalize the rates of disability compensation payable to veterans of peacetime and wartime service; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 7852. A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to furnish assistance to certain disabled veterans of the induction period in the purchase of an automobile or other conveyance; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. VAN DEERLIN:

H.R. 7853. A bill to repeal the excise tax on amounts paid for communication services or facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H.R. 7854. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase from \$600 to \$1,000 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemptions for old age and blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BONNER:

H.R. 7855. A bill to authorize appropriations for procurement of small patrol cutters for the Coast Guard; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MAILLIARD:

H.R. 7856. A bill to authorize appropriations for procurement of small patrol cutters for the Coast Guard; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BRADEMANS:

H.R. 7857. A bill to extend the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act of 1961; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CLANCY:

H.R. 7858. A bill relating to withholding, for purposes of the income tax imposed by certain cities, on the compensation of Federal employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLEVELAND:

H.R. 7859. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide for the loss of U.S. citizenship by a person who applies for naturalization in a foreign state, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINDLEY:

H.R. 7860. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the income tax treatment of soil and water conservation expenditures; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GIBBONS:

H.R. 7861. A bill to expand the war on poverty and enhance the effectiveness of programs under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HENDERSON:

H.R. 7862. A bill to amend the Dual Compensation Act with respect to the compensation for public school teachers of the District of Columbia for employment in civilian offices during the summer vacation period; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HORTON:

H.R. 7863. A bill to amend the Export Control Act of 1949; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. KEE:

H.R. 7864. A bill relating to the construction, modification, alteration, repair, painting, or decoration of buildings leased for public purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. LENNON:

H.R. 7865. A bill to amend Public Law 89-13 by increasing authorization for construction of patrol vessels and helicopters; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

**By Mr. LIPSCOMB:**  
H.R. 7866. A bill to extend the Export Control Act of 1949 for 2 additional years; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

**By Mr. MACDONALD:**  
H.R. 7867. A bill to establish uniform dates throughout the United States for the commencing and ending of daylight saving time in those States and local jurisdictions where it is observed, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 7868. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, with respect to recovery of a reasonable attorney's fee in case of successful maintenance of an action for recovery of damages sustained in transportation of property; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

**By Mr. MULTER (by request):**  
H.R. 7869. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 7870. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 7871. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act for the purpose of prohibiting certain sales below cost; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 7872. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act for the purpose of prohibiting certain sales below cost; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

**By Mr. ST GERMAIN:**  
H.R. 7873. A bill to amend the Export Control Act of 1949; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

**By Mr. SKUBITZ:**  
H.R. 7874. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to authorize and facilitate the deduction from gross income by teachers of the expenses of education (including certain travel) undertaken by them, and to provide a uniform method of proving entitlement to such deduction; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

**By Mr. WIDNALL:**  
H.R. 7875. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make certain feed grains available for laying chickens in emergency areas, in order to provide family farm egg producers the same kind of assistance now provided dairy farmers; to the Committee on Agriculture.

**By Mr. GATHINGS:**  
H.J. Res. 444. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

**By Mr. BARRETT:**  
H.J. Res. 445. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

**By Mr. BURLESON:**  
H.J. Res. 446. Joint resolution to authorize the Architect of the Capitol to construct the third Library of Congress Building in square 732 in the District of Columbia, to be named the James Madison Memorial Building and to contain a Madison Memorial Hall, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

**By Mr. PEPPER:**  
H. Con. Res. 407. Concurrent resolution establishing a joint committee composed of Members of the House of Representatives and the Senate to conduct a full and complete investigation of any and all matters pertaining to crime in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Rules.

**By Mr. HANLEY:**  
H. Res. 362. Resolution to stop the transfer of the Naval Training Devices Center at Sands Point, N.Y., pending an investigation; to the Committee on Armed Services.

**By Mr. McGRATH:**  
H. Res. 363. Resolution to stop the transfer of the Naval Training Devices Center at Sands Point, N.Y., pending an investigation; to the Committee on Armed Services.

**MEMORIALS**

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

243. **By Mr. CONTE:** Memorial of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, resolutions relative to the decision of the Civil Aeronautics Board in Washington to reject the application of Northeast Airlines for a permanent certificate to run commercial flights between Boston and Florida; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

244. **By the SPEAKER:** Memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York, relative to the enactment of H.R. 424 which grants the physically handicapped certain deductions and an additional exemption of their Federal income payments; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

**PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS**

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

**By Mr. ADAIR:**  
H.R. 7876. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Norma Y. Teixeira, her husband, and their minor unmarried children, and Mrs. Greta Teixeira, her husband, and their minor unmarried children; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

**By Mr. ANNUNZIO:**  
H.R. 7877. A bill for the relief of Nenita Toring Ortega; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

**By Mr. BETTS:**  
H.R. 7878. A bill for the relief of Maj. Duran L. Spivey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

**By Mr. BINGHAM:**  
H.R. 7879. A bill for the relief of Luigi Starita; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

**By Mr. CELLER:**  
H.R. 7880. A bill for the relief of Joan Jackson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

**By Mr. CLANCY:**  
H.R. 7881. A bill for the relief of Adamantios (Adam) Catsaros; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7882. A bill for the relief of Dr. Francisco Pascual; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

**By Mr. COLLIER:**  
H.R. 7883. A bill for the relief of Anica Samardzia Vavan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

**By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:**  
H.R. 7884. A bill for the relief of Cesare Tambellini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

**By Mr. GILBERT:**  
H.R. 7885. A bill for the relief of Miss Sylvia Kronfeld; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

**By Mr. HALPERN:**  
H.R. 7886. A bill for the relief of Margaret Elizabeth Westby; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

**By Mr. LINDSAY:**  
H.R. 7887. A bill for the relief of Madelini Fotiades; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

**By Mr. MACDONALD:**  
H.R. 7888. A bill providing for the extension of patent No. D-119,187; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

**By Mr. MOORE:**  
H.R. 7889. A bill for the relief of Ben M. Bagon, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

**By Mr. PUCINSKI:**  
H.R. 7890. A bill for the relief of Petros Kogiones; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7891. A bill for the relief of Anastasia Haralambopovlov; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

**By Mr. RYAN:**  
H.R. 7892. A bill for the relief of Claudette Maureen Callender; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7893. A bill for the relief of Albert Maurice Fowler; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

**By Mr. STEED:**  
H.R. 7894. A bill for the relief of Joseph B. Blankenship; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

**By Mr. WAGGONER:**  
H.R. 7895. A bill for the relief of Hiromi Tezuka Harper; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

**EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS**

**Conservation**

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF**

**HON. CLAIR CALLAN**

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1965

Mr. CALLAN. Mr. Speaker, the efforts of farmers and others in the field of conservation has meant a more beautiful as well as a more bountiful America. Conservation, together with other pro-

grams to provide increased parks and open space, promises to give us still greater beauty as we built upon past accomplishments in making wise use of the land.

We have seen it everywhere in Nebraska—green grass to replace eroded gullies, well managed farm and ranch lands to replace water-scarred and wind-seared fields, conservation ponds and lakes for water management, water supply and recreation facilities on farms and in small watershed projects. All these things have meant a more beautiful Nebraska while saving the land from

mutilation and destruction and improving the rural economy.

A beautiful landscape has universal appeal and is becoming all too scarce. The rural countryside beckons the town-weary Americans seeking restful surroundings. What the countryside provides is the responsibility of all of the people. The ugly signs of rural poverty still are around us. Impoverished farm and ranch lands still deprive the Nation of a greater beauty and a greater prosperity which can be had.

Nebraskans, through their efforts to conserve and develop the soil and water